

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

'IN the beginning, God'—in these grand words our Bible opens its wonderful story. It is a very splendid beginning, and it would be a very splendid motto for the New Year; for the work which is begun with God as the great Companion of our way will have some chance of being continued and ended in Him, with infinite profit to ourselves, and—so far as we can affect it—to the work of the world.

Of course those words refer in their original setting to the creative power of God. This is an idea which in the Bible receives much more emphasis and is of vastly more religious value than we are accustomed to suppose. It appears in the earlier (Gn 2) no less than in the later story of Creation (Gn 1). It is one of the dominant ideas in the appeals of the great prophet of the Exile (Is 40-55), it is in a sense the climax of the Book of Job (chs. 38-39), it is presented with singular comprehensiveness and beauty in the great Nature Psalm, so-called (Ps 104), and in other psalms it is touched upon, yet so lightly and incidentally that by the careless reader its full religious significance is apt to be overlooked, as in Ps 121, where the writer says, 'My help cometh from the *LORD who made heaven and earth.*' The wonderful thing is that it is no less a One than the God of the universe, its Creator and Sustainer, who condescends to take His place 'at my right hand.'

Now even those of us who are not scientists by

training or inclination ought to strive to recapture the wonder of this thought, and to watch with gratitude its re-establishment among the ideas which are being emphasized by many of the great exponents of science to-day. The day is gone—let us hope for ever—when the universe can be regarded as a gigantic machine. Behind it—it is being increasingly felt and proclaimed—is Mind, Soul, call it what you will, but something, or rather some One, of a capacity inconceivable to our imagination, who originated and sustains it. The Bible calls this some one God, it finds Him controlling Nature and history; and the glory of the individual life is that it can link itself in glad submission to this 'Lord of all being, throned afar,' and reinforce its own feeble resources by the resources of Him who is the 'Centre and Soul of every sphere.'

The Bible's interest in ideas is always a religious rather than a scientific interest. Its satisfaction, for example, at the contemplation of Nature is never merely scientific or even æsthetic. Even if he could, the Hebrew would never have spelt Nature with a capital letter; Nature was not God, it was God's, a revelation of His power and wisdom. Thus there are, strictly speaking, no Nature Psalms in the Bible: the thoughts which Nature evokes are always used to confirm the religious temper and reinforce the religious life. The poet who looked upon the midnight sky with its moon and stars was led to think with grateful awe that the

God who hung them there was his God, mindful every day of His seemingly so insignificant creature, and he was filled with reverent wonder that this God 'so kind to him should be.'

despite all the folly and wickedness of men. What a source of strength to remember that it is He who is 'the Maker of heaven and earth' and who 'keepeth Israel' that 'keepeth thee.'

The creative power of God is set forth in terms of peculiar grandeur and impressiveness by Deutero-Isaiah, but he has a purely practical and religious end in view. He is addressing people whose hope has been crushed out of them by the sorrows of the Exile, men who are saying, 'My way is hidden from the Lord, and my case is being ignored by my God.' And he seeks to rekindle their flickering hope by recalling them to the thought of God as Creator and Sustainer of the universe, never faint and never weary. Similarly, the wonderful panorama which is brought before the eyes of Job (ch. 38 f.) in language of extraordinary splendour is designed to remind him of the mysterious power and wisdom and care with which the universe, of which he is a part, is everlastingly sustained.

And it is not for nothing that Pss 103 and 104 are placed together. Even Ps 104 by itself is very much more than a noble eulogy of the creative power of God. It is instinct with the feeling of the love which inspired the great creative process and kept in view throughout it all the ultimate needs not only of human but of animal life. But how much more deeply charged with meaning and comfort does Ps 103 become, when it is realized that the God who forgives our iniquities and heals our diseases and pities us as a father his children is the God of unimaginable power and majesty, who covers Himself with light as with a garment, who stretches out the heavens like a curtain, and who laid the foundations of the world.

Perhaps this thought appears in its most intimately tender form in Ps 139. There the God from whose presence there is no escape touches human life in every detail and in the most vital way; and this God of the personal life is the God of the infinite spaces, Lord of all the generations of men, who sits as King upon His everlasting throne, high and lifted up, Lord of history, whose sublime purpose marches down the ages triumphant,

What this God is like, those know who have looked upon the face of Jesus Christ. As with full surrender of heart and life we can trust Jesus whose ways we know and whose witness is self-authenticating, so, and with a confidence no less, may we trust the God whom no man hath seen at any time, but whose name is Love, yesterday, to-day, and for ever. If we have the assurance that God is with us 'in the beginning' of our New Year, we may go forward with good hope to all its experiences, despite all political, economic, and individual perplexities, believing that the God who day by day sustains the world which His own fingers framed will no less surely sustain the souls of those who put their trust in Him.

A generation ago the works of a popular writer of religious stories for girls had a great vogue. One of the favourite themes of the authoress was that of the Philadelphia business man who had acquired immense wealth and lived in an enormous house and yet was always in his place in church, of the Boston lawyer who got steeper fees than any other lawyer in town and yet conducted a Bible class for 'down-town' boys, of one who owned the largest dry-goods store in New York and yet never missed the weekly prayer meeting. In our own day it is not unknown for the Church to receive the patronage of distinguished sportsmen.

If we do not feel that the Christian gospel needs these letters of recommendation from men who have won eminence in walks of life that are not distinctively Christian, correspondingly we are not depressed when our religion does not win the approval of well-known philosophers or novelists whose books sell by the thousand. Two criticisms of Christ are dealt with in *What shall we say of Christ?* by the Rev. Sydney CAVE, D.D., President of Cheshunt College, Cambridge (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. net), a book written with all Dr. CAVE's accustomed scholarship and grace.

Mr. Bertrand Russell finds one 'very serious defect' in the moral character of Christ, namely, that He believed in eternal punishment. One repeatedly finds in Christ 'a vindictive fury against those people who would not listen to his preaching—an attitude which is not uncommon with preachers, but which does somewhat detract from superlative excellence. You do not, for instance, find that attitude in Socrates. You find him quite bland and urbane towards the people who would not listen to him.' Dr. CAVE has no difficulty in showing that Mr. Bertrand Russell, far from knowing the elements of New Testament criticism, does not seem even to have read the Gospels in the Revised Version.

Mr. Russell's criticism, then, is that Christ did not show superlative excellence, that He was not always quite bland and urbane. Mr. H. G. Wells' objection to Christ is that He *did* show superlative excellence, that He was *too* bland and urbane. 'The Christian's Christ is too fine for me, not incarnate enough, not flesh enough, not earth enough. He was never foolish and hot-eared and inarticulate, never vain, he never forgot things, nor tangled his miracles.' One wonders if Mr. Wells has ever listened to anti-Christian street oratory. If he had, he might have learned that one of the Secularist charges against Him is just that He was 'hot-eared,' as in His scathing denunciation of the Pharisees in Mt 23.

But the question Mr. Wells raises is one of great practical importance, and it is one which we are all competent to answer for ourselves. When the prodigal repents, will he or will he not be more effective as a Christian preacher than the elder brother who needs no repentance? Do those confessions of sin which have so prominent a place in the Oxford Movement increase or diminish the influence of those who make them?

The late Dr. Denney once warned his students against an indiscriminate use of the principle of accommodation. He pictured a clergyman sitting by the kitchen-fire of a member of his congregation and talking the language of the people with the

accent of the people, under the impression that he was making himself all things to all men and so becoming a better pastor.

But the difficulty chiefly concerns grave moral lapses. A fellow-feeling makes us wondrous kind. Does the knowledge that our religious guide has shown himself as weak as ourselves make him a more trusted guide? The writer 'To the Hebrews' was quite clear on the point. It was our Lord's fellowship in our temptations, not in our sin, that qualified Him to be our high-priest. Our Lord was tempted in all points like as ourselves; but if the statement had ended there, we should have found in Him no refuge and no strength. The 'yet without sin' is not an added ornament; it is of the very essence of the matter.

The knowledge that the Christian preacher has to contend with the same temptations as other men is a powerful asset in his dealings with them. The knowledge that he has yielded to these temptations is always a source of weakness, never in any degree a source of strength. If one has fallen before one of these temptations and afterwards, by the grace of God, overcome it, his victory will give encouragement to others engaged in the same struggle. But there is a certain degree of moral failure which, however much we may repent of it, or however much we may be conscious of forgiveness, will, for all practical purposes, effectually extinguish our influence as Christian leaders.

Dr. Charles E. RAVEN's Inaugural Lecture as Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge has been published in pamphlet form under the title *Signs of the Times* (Cambridge University Press; 2s. net). The lecture offers some reflections—in the light of present-day attitudes—on the scope and opportunity of theology. It is a characteristic piece of writing, and it admirably fulfils the purpose of an Inaugural Lecture.

Professor RAVEN finds that theology is condemned in certain quarters as having failed in three direc-

tions. It has failed (1) to supply a coherent, unifying, and practicable interpretation of the universe, (2) to lay stress upon the personality of Jesus Christ, (3) to disclose the Spirit's resources of power.

(1) Undoubtedly there is need for a coherent interpretation of the meaning and worth of existence. Without such there can be among us no common purpose, no common ideals of life, no unity in the realm of international and inter-racial relationships; and the aspiration after unity finds increasingly clamant expression in our time. And if the interpretation of the universe is to be compelling, it must satisfy not only man's intelligence but also his emotional and moral nature. It must, in fact, be a religion.

To judge by recent output, theologians are fully aware of the need of constructing a system of thought which shall do justice to our best knowledge of the natural world and to the highest experiences of religion. At a time of rapid and revolutionary change this is an enormously difficult task. But that it has been essayed in the University of Cambridge, Dr. Tennant's 'Philosophical Theology' and Dr. Oman's 'The Natural and the Supernatural' bear witness.

(2) Besides the need for unity, there is also strongly felt among us the need for a re-assertion of the worth of personality and for a re-ordering of our society and our standards on the basis of personal relationships. This need is experienced both in the world of industry, where the machine tends to negate personality, and in the world of thought, where also the worth and liberty of the person are threatened by the impersonal, the mechanical, the standardized (whether in poetry or painting, in religion or ethics).

It must be allowed that the personality of Christ has not been interpreted so fully and freely among us as it might have been. For the past two generations Biblical scholarship has been directed towards intensive study of the text, the authenticity, the dating, and the detailed criticism of the docu-

ments. But it has been the prelude to a greater task. The interpretation of the significance of the teaching and the Person of Jesus Christ should now increasingly dominate our studies. In doctrinal theology we should devote ourselves to the exposition of the Incarnation. This would do more than anything else to unfold the true character and highest possibilities of personality.

(3) A third aspiration of our time, occasioned by the failure to achieve the others, is the craving for power. The craze for speed and excitement, the enthusiasm for records and championships, the many-avenued search for spiritual comfort, all testify to man's need for power and consciousness of weakness.

Where the Church neglects or misunderstands the doctrine of the Spirit of power, from whom come the gifts of love, joy, and peace, it cannot expect to commend its message. And alongside of special study of the Holy Spirit and of His presence in the ordered life of the Church should go an endeavour to relate the work of the Holy Spirit more closely to the particular circumstances and practical requirements of our own time. The nature and use of money, of leisure and recreation, of sex and marriage, of commerce and industry, of government and racial contacts—on these and similar matters our future preachers should be helped to form considered and Christian convictions.

Clearly these three signs of the times correspond not only to the criticisms commonly passed upon theology, but to the central tenets of the Christian religion. 'One God, the Father, in whom we live and move and have our being; one Lord Jesus Christ, Son of Man and Son of God, unique image of deity, supreme and effective symbol of the eternal; one Holy Spirit, lord and life-giver, inspirer of the individual, creator of the fellowship; these three express our belief that man's present quest is for nothing other than that which theology has formulated and proclaims.'

There has been a welcome reaction in recent times against the mediæval conception of Christ as a pale, ghostly figure, and also against the 'Sunday-school' conception of Him as 'Gentle Jesus, meek and mild.' We are being taken straight to the Gospels in order to discover the real Jesus as the Evangelists have depicted Him and suggested Him. This picture has nowhere been more convincingly portrayed than in Mr. A. P. TERHUNE's recent book, *The Son of God*, noticed briefly in our last issue. The interest of Mr. TERHUNE's presentation is increased by the fact that, as he explains, he has never read any 'life' of Jesus, but has taken his idea of Him from the Gospels alone.

Here is the truth as Mr. TERHUNE has discovered for himself. In the first place, Jesus was a carpenter, and carpenter work, in that day and in that region, was no job for a weakling. 'In my own very young manhood I used to stand by the hour at the unfronted entrance of the shop [at Nazareth] and watch the men at work. They had no modern labour-saving appliances. Tough logs must be hewn by hand with awkward tools. Beams and joists weighing hundreds of pounds often must be handled and swung aloft without pulleys. The day's labour called for more strength than skill. The Nazareth carpenter and his helpers whom I used to watch were squat fellows. They were bulging of muscle, stalwart in every inch; unbelievably powerful at lifting and chopping and hammering. The fragile and womanish body of the Christ of the stained-glass windows—how long could such a puny physique have lasted in a job like that? Yet, presumably, from His twelfth until His thirtieth year Christ was toiling constantly at just such labour. None but a strong man could have done that.'

Mr. TERHUNE points out that the forty days' fast was possible only for an unusually vigorous frame. Many notoriety hunters have tried the experiment, with the result that long before the end of the ordeal they were in a state of collapse. Weeks of recuperation and careful feeding were needed to build up their hunger-wasted systems.

It was not very long after the wilderness fast that Jesus was mobbed by His fellow-Nazarenes who intended to throw Him down from the hilltop. Few normal men could have escaped rough handling at the least. But Jesus 'passing through the midst of them, went his way.' St. Luke devotes only these few words to a feat which is remarkable from any point of view. Even if 'giant strength' were not needed, the scene sets before us One whose personality and authority were sufficient to baulk the crowd and drive them out of His path.

A point of very real significance is the tremendous strain of the journeys Jesus undertook. 'I used to try to duplicate some of the daily foot journeys of Christ through the Holy Land. I was young and an athlete, and I was well shod. Jesus had been barefoot [did He not have sandals?], and often wearied by long journeys on the preceding days and by scarcity of food. Yet I found one or two of those walking records, across the steep mountains, impossible for me to equal. No frail stained-glass Christ could have accomplished such body-wracking hikes.' The facts are perhaps here pressed a little too hard, but the suggestion of bodily fitness implied in the actual conditions of the daily life of Jesus is soundly based. Another picture which confirms what has been urged about the physical frame of Jesus is His Cleansing of the Temple. 'Men do not run away, leaving their goods behind them, unless their fear of the assailant who drives them away is greater than their desire for the valuables they are deserting.'

But it is not mere physical strength and fitness that are predominantly depicted in the Gospels. It is the power of Christ's personality that is everywhere clearly suggested. Look at some of the glimpses we have of Him. First of all, His steadfast resolution to go down to Jerusalem when He knew what awaited Him there. By turning back He might have lived comfortably to a serene old age. Neither Rome nor Judaism would have molested Him, whereas shame and desertion and crucifixion awaited Him in the Capital. And 'He set his face steadfastly to go to Jerusalem.' He might have escaped at any time during these

fateful days in Jerusalem. But He refused. In the same Spirit He refused the relief on the Cross of a stupefying drug which was frequently procured for a crucified criminal by his friends. He forgot His pain, indeed, to comfort the dying thief who was crucified beside Him. These pictures of Jesus are typical. Like instances could be multiplied to show the untruth of the traditional representations of Jesus found in 'Christian art' and in conventional religious teaching.

Mr. TERHUNE takes as the climax of his own presentation the moment on the Cross when Jesus uttered the words, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' These words are commonly interpreted as a cry of dereliction, expressing the Saviour's dreadful sense of forsakenness. But to Mr. TERHUNE this is inconceivable. And it is also unnecessary. The words are the opening sentence of one of the Psalms, the twenty-second. The

Psalm was known by its first line, as 'Rock of Ages,' 'Nearer, my God, to Thee' are known to us. In this Psalm there are many phrases that could be read into His own experience, such as 'they pierced my hands and my feet.' And Jesus was repeating the Psalm to Himself as He hung on the Cross. Why? To comfort His friends who were there, says Mr. TERHUNE, by reminding them that all this had been foretold long ago. It was His supreme act of self-forgetfulness, the finest instance of His 'shining strength.' We may not be able to follow the author in this interpretation, and yet accept the fact that this cry was not one of desolation. For the twenty-second Psalm was really a song of trust in God, and Jesus may have been repeating it to Himself as a simple act of confidence in His Father. The words the onlookers caught were the opening words. But they may not have meant what traditional theology asserts they meant.

Brunner and the Moral Problems of our Time.

BY THE REVEREND SYDNEY CAVE, M.A., D.D., PRESIDENT OF CHESHUNT COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

THE title of this article may seem to some to savour of paradox. Brunner is a Barthian, and what have Barthians to say on the moral problems of our age? In his famous Commentary on Romans, Barth was as contemptuous of Christian Ethics as of Christian theology. Barth has long since recovered from what he later called 'the childish disease of being ashamed of theology,' but he still speaks as if we should jettison the whole development of theology from Schleiermacher through Ritschl, and in his Prolegomena to Theology (*Die Lehre vom Worte Gottes*) quotes with most approval the words of the Schoolmen of Protestant Orthodoxy, and that Orthodoxy was too concerned with correct belief to be much interested in moral problems.

Brunner writes without the violence of Barth, and is not, as Barth often is, the victim of a love for paradoxes. But his great book, *The Mediator* (*Der Mittler*), described by Canon Mozley in the September issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, poured

bitter scorn on modern attempts to describe the Jesus of history. All such attempts are variants of the one theme: that men do not believe in Christ. In spite of the concluding paragraphs in which he speaks of following Christ being the consequence of faith in Him, a casual reading of the book could easily lead to the view that Brunner, too, had little interest in modern perplexities of conduct. It has been from the attempts to understand the Jesus of history which he condemns that modern movements in Christianity to deal with social problems have often sprung.

The publication a few months ago of Brunner's book, *The Command and the Ordinances* (*Das Gebot und die Ordnungen*), makes it impossible for any honest critic of the Barthian movement any longer to speak as if it had nothing to say on our modern problems. To the reviewer it seems one of the most suggestive and significant books on Christian Ethics he has read. Brunner writes with a knowledge of how many men have actually to

ive which is lacking in many books on Christian Ethics written by men who are themselves protected from the cruel insecurity of modern industrialism. The book is a massive work of some seven hundred pages. Brunner describes it as an *Outline of Protestant Theological Ethic*. He tells us that as he read in its preparation other books on Christian Ethics, he found to his surprise that although there are many Protestant books on Ethics, none sprang from 'the centre of evangelical faith.' Many so-called Protestant Ethics are really Catholic in their teaching, for they are not based on the central Protestant doctrine of justification by faith. A truly Christian Ethic must not attempt to say what we ought to do. It should not make decisions, but should be preparatory to a decision. Otherwise it will be legalistic, and 'the chronic disease of legalism is the conflict of duties.' There is but one Christian command: the command to love. And what love in the Christian sense is we know, first through what God did in the Cross of Christ. Christian Ethics is the science of human activity as defined by the divine activity' in the Incarnation and the Cross of Christ. 'Love in the sense of the New Testament is not a possibility of man, but solely the possibility of God.' 'To be "in love" is not something man can be of himself; it is given to man through faith in God.' 'We are not—that is the meaning of the phrase, image of God—fixed stars; God alone shines in His own light; He alone has aseity. We are planets, which can only shine in borrowed light, in His light.'

Brunner passes from the discussion of the one command of love to consider the Creative Ordinances of God, which are the means chosen by the divine wisdom to bring men into those social relations in which alone human life can be lived. 'The first and most fundamental social relation is that of sex. Then follow the social relations connected with the provision of human needs and industry, and the social relations of race, State, and Church.'

In his application of the law of love to the specific circumstances of these various social relations, Brunner writes with a sober sense that these relations have all been perverted by sin. 'We must not for a moment forget that we know the creation of God only as marred by sin and treated men only as sinners.' It is only in the external activities of men that progress can be discerned and perfection is possible. 'When we look at the moral sphere, we have to say, there is no work which does not bear the finger-mark of sinful man.' There is progress in scientific technique

and research. 'A more or less continuous upward line can be traced from the rough stone hammer of palæolithic man to the electric dynamo.' But when we pass from life's circumference to its centre progress is more doubtful. 'Who in this age of motoring and of the world-war will dare affirm that human life is now more valued?' 'There is scarcely a good discovery which is not at once brought into the devil's use. Men are pressed nearer together, and the individual is more lonely. Christianity has spread itself over the world, but with this there is an atheism of the masses unknown in earlier times. And if we speak of the individual, who will assert that men are better than they used to be?' Brunner's words may sound to many too sombre. But at least his sober estimate of man saves him from the cruelty of an easy idealism, and he judges of modern problems as one who knows how hard life is for many.

It is impossible in one brief article to discuss the solutions which he suggests. As this book has only recently been published and is as yet but little known to English readers, it seems better to describe his treatment of moral problems without comment, whether of agreement or dissent, and as far as possible in his own words.

Marriage.—The crisis of marriage is a permanent phenomenon of history in that monogamy has always had to fight against other forms of sex-relationships, whether legal or illegal. And this is specially true of the history of Christianity owing to its strong demand for monogamy—a demand which has never been completely met. But, in the strict sense of the word, the crisis of marriage is a quite new phenomenon which in the last decades—we might even say, in the last decade—has caused the moral demand for monogamous marriage to be widely questioned both in theory and practice. The causes of this crisis are many: the destruction of the economic unity of the family, the housing-shortage of the great towns, the economic, social, legal, political, and spiritual emancipation of woman, the discovery of contraceptives, and, above all, those deep spiritual changes which have as their watchword the claim to 'the right of personality.' The crisis of marriage presents to-day the most serious and difficult problem of Christian ethics. And it is a problem which is too often dealt with in a merely conventional way. 'It is in its treatment of marriage that all Protestant ethics remains anabaptist or catholic; it is here that it turns the Sermon on the Mount into a "law."' But the problem cannot be solved by

an appeal to verses of Scripture. The seventh commandment requires to be founded in theology ; it is necessary to show the connexion of this commandment with the Biblical understanding of God and man.

The principle of monogamy cannot be assumed as self-evident. The subjective-idealist interpretation of its origin is inadequate. It is by no means obvious that a man can only love one woman at a time. If marriage be based on love, it is lost in advance. The lover cannot guarantee either the permanence or the soleness of his feeling of love, and marriage thus becomes only hypothetically possible. To base marriage on love is thus to build a house on sand. It is, indeed, this subjective idealism which more than anything else is the cause of the present crisis of marriage.

'Christian faith derives the validity of its demand for monogamy on the divine ordinance of creation.' 'Marriage is not a sacrament—and Protestant ethicists should cease at last to play with this conception of late Catholic ethics—but it is a *Sanctum*.' 'The sexual is not evil in itself ; it is evil if separated from the personal bond of loyalty. It is the isolation of the sexual that is evil.' 'Marriage is the divinely created school of social relations, in which a man can learn that he can live not in isolation but in relation to another.'

What we recognize in the divine creative ordinance is the idea of marriage. 'This idea no more corresponds to its actuality than an actual man corresponds to the idea of man as God's image. As there are only sinful men, so there is only sinful marriage—marriage which is at the same time adultery.' That is a hard saying. It seems extravagant to say, as Brunner does, that 'the absolute law which Jesus taught about the sinful look makes each one of us an adulterer.'

The fact of universal sin most deeply modifies the moral problem of marriage. Protestant ethic must recognize this fact. Only as it does so will it free itself from the legalism of its Catholic heritage. The first modification of the moral problem of marriage by the recognition of the fact of sin lies in the added purpose of marriage as *remedium concupiscentiae*. Marriage is, as experience shows, the *Optimum* between complete asceticism and any other form of sexual relationship. The erotic-sexual impulse, in itself, like all that God created, pure and good, has through sin become a great peril for the life of the individual as of the community. What erotics regard as the fundamental fault of marriage—a certain tempering and

'domestication' of the wild erotic impulse—is one of the blessings of marriage.

A second modification, which the recognition of the fact of sin makes on the morality of marriage, is this : 'Since all are adulterers (*sic*), distinctions among men are only relative.' The man who has not committed adultery according to the civil law cannot, on this account, boast that he has kept the seventh commandment. It is from this point of view that Brunner views the problems of divorce. Cases may arise when a man, in order to obey God's command, must act 'against the law,' the law expressed by the idea of marriage, which is God's creative ordinance. The recognition of the command of love—i.e. the recognition of grace—may in the concrete case within the sinful reality necessitate the breach of the generally formulated law of the creative ordinance of the idea of marriage. Brunner complains that even Protestants fail adequately to realize this. 'It is the curse of "Christian morality" that it always regards the most legal conception as the most "earnest." 'Above all ordinances, even above the ordinances of creation, stands the will of God which here and now demands of me that I act to my neighbour with responsible love. But in a sinful complex world, no general law can lay down in advance what that action must be.'

Brunner proceeds to discuss the separate problems of marriage. Marriage cannot be founded on love. 'It originates in love, but it has its continuance in loyalty.' 'A marriage without love is a misfortune which requires for its endurance a moral energy and a heroic conception of life which for most men is beyond their powers.' "'Christian morality" for centuries, under the influence of false ideas of chastity, and of the ideal of virginity, has so persistently failed to recognize the importance of the natural ground-element of marriage and has so foolishly tabooed the emphasis on its importance as "unspirituality" . . . that the violent eruption of suppressed nature which we now experience, had to come.' 'A legalistic and falsely spiritual Puritanism and Pietism' departed from the realism of the Reformers, and the 'suppression from the side of the Christian society, due to this wrong development, of the elementary rights of human nature is the chief cause of the present chaos.'

'A marriage without love, and that means without sexual attraction, ought never to be made. If it is made, it carries in itself the seed of dissolution. The spirit, especially if it be created by faith, can carry on a conflict with nature, and perhaps against nature maintains the marriage. But even at the

best a high price has to be paid for the victory; in many cases the price is too high. For the sake of love to the neighbour, the dissolution of such a marriage is the sole moral duty.'

Brunner's teaching here will offend some by its seeming laxity. But he vigorously protests that it is necessary to remember in view of the 'sexual-panic' of our time that full manhood is possible even if the sexual instinct be denied. 'That a man can only be a complete man in marriage or through sexual experience is an over-emphasis and false generalization which is contradicted a thousand times over by experience.' In view of the number of women who in these hard times are necessarily unmarried, it is absurd and cruel while maintaining the principle of monogamy, which excludes one-third of womanhood from motherhood, to assert that the woman belongs to the home and has motherhood for her vocation. Instead, the Church needs to give to women a large place in its life that they may find there a worthy substitute for the vocation of motherhood denied to so many of them to-day.

On the problem of children, Brunner writes: 'It belongs to marriage that it is fruitful, but that does not mean that it must be unlimitedly fruitful.' Birth-regulation is to-day an obvious duty of married couples. The word is new, but not the thing itself, and new, too, are certain methods of securing this. Asceticism in marriage is one way. Experience shows that it is a possible way, but it means 'a terrible, and for many a perilous, overruling of body and soul and contradicts the Bible word, What God hath joined, let no man put asunder.' Modern contraceptives are neither better nor worse than old methods, and among these old methods Brunner includes the recent Calendar of safe times issued by the Roman Church (in the *Encyclica casti connubii*). Brunner prefers not to use the American term 'birth-control,' but to use 'the beautiful German word found by a woman, *verantwortliche Mutterschaft*,' 'responsible motherhood.' The new discoveries have led to the avoidance of parenthood from motives of luxury and convenience. 'This is a very grave peril, but is it worse than the involuntary fruitfulness of the last century?'

The concluding paragraphs of this section deal with the bearing of industrialism on marriage. The necessity of women working in industry has led to the almost complete destruction of the common life of the home. Since many men are unable to maintain wife and children, marriage of the old kind is impossible for many. In consequence,

modern industrialism has led to 'free relationships.' Brunner, of course, condemns such irregular relations. It is better, instead, that such should marry, even although their marriage be at first deliberately childless. Such marriages are imperfect, and may yet provide the best conscientious solution of an individual life-problem. It has at the same time to be emphasized that the real cause many young people to-day shrink from marriage or from parenthood is their eagerness for pleasure and the excessive claims they make on life.

Brunner concludes his sober treatment of the problems of marriage with the warning that 'only in the deepest meaning of faith can the truth of marriage be again found. Only in the renewal of faith can the forces operate by which the crisis of marriage can be overcome. But that does not mean that Christian faith "solves" the problem of marriage. Even the marriage of the best Christians is not Paradise Regained. . . . A happy marriage has, indeed, its own special perils, the peril of false exclusiveness and self-satisfaction, the peril of the Pharisaic denial of solidarity with suffering, erring, and curse-bearing humanity.' 'In the ethic of marriage the last word must be, Live by the divine forgiveness.'

Of his discussion of other moral problems it is possible to speak more briefly, for Brunner's discussion is likely to cause in this country less offence and is less liable to be misunderstood.

Work and Civilization.—The problem of work falls within the sphere of theological ethics, in that work is an act of freedom. In relation to work also we stand under the command of God. Civilization and work, as the Reformers saw, are also a creative ordinance of God. The Bible teaches that work is meant to be service of the community. It is not what a man does, but why he does it, which determines the ethical quality of his work. Where work is prized in isolation, it becomes an idol. Where the meaning of work is no longer recognized, men lose the sense that they belong to God and become slaves of the world, and they lose also their sense of social obligation. Civilization is thus changed from a divine ordinance into a curse, and there arises the crisis of joy in work, and of unemployment. A man is a mere cog in a machine when he does not know what he does nor whom he serves, but knows only that through his work others are rich, while he is poor. In these circumstances, humanly speaking, it becomes impossible for him to recognize his vocation as God-given. Unemployment is the sign that a curse lies over modern

European industry. The cry of millions—Give us work—is something new in the history of the world. What an epigram on our civilization is the unemployment of a large part of the civilized world.

Industry.—Here, too, we can see a creative ordinance of God, but an ordinance broken by human sin. Work in industry is hallowed because and in so far as it is a sharing of the divine work of conservation of the race by provision for human needs. But industry, as we know it, bears always the curse of sin. Not only the individual's share in industry, but the industrial order as a whole into which we are born, has this characteristic. It is not possible for the individual sinlessly to take his part in industry. It is here that we have the clearest sign of the truth of the doctrine of hereditary sin, and of the falsehood of the individualism which asserts man's freedom. 'Actual industry is the field of the most brutal conflict of force, and it is no accident that Darwin's theory of the survival of the fittest was thought out in the age and land of Manchester Capitalism.' Sombart's description of Capitalism as 'monstrous' is no exaggeration. 'Is it possible in an industrial organization which is anti-personal to develop the personal meaning of work? Can the proletarian or the capitalist understand what we theologians, who stand only on the circumference of this terrible, soulless world, say about calling, service, and the worth of work?' 'This capitalist system is unserviceable, worthless, irresponsible; more, it is irresponsibility become a system.'

'Yet we know that no system is simply fate. Even in this system the individual, to whom God has given faith and from whom He demands a life of faith and love, has opportunity within the meshes of a loveless system of showing love.' Men can, as capitalists, be in heart anti-capitalist and make some change, however little, in the system. Men can, as proletarians—if only by God's special grace—understand the meaning of the words calling, service, and love, and with these thoughts do their work in this cruel machinery of a Profit-system as service to the community. And, in spite of all, it is this industry which provides us all, good and bad, with food; through it God now maintains our life. Many aspects of the capitalist industrial order are for the immediate future simply our fate. We cannot if we would go back from the industrial order to simpler times. 'It would be not only quixotic to dream ourselves back into medievalism; it would be the greatest lovelessness.' The immense populations of the modern world can only be maintained through technical

mass-production and rationalized industry. Capitalism in its technical, industrial sense will remain the constant factor of every future industrial order, however it be called. 'The most "humane" system of industry is more cruel than an "inhuman" system if it does not provide men with their necessities.' Meanwhile, the Christian 'has to swim against the stream.'

Brunner ends this long section of his book with four theses on the duty of the Church in regard to industry:

(1) 'In regard to the need and sin of industry also, the Church has to proclaim the Gospel of the creation, reconciliation, and redemption of the world through God revealed in Christ. This Gospel, not any "social gospel," is the world's salvation in respect also of industry.'

(2) The Christian Church has as a society the duty of ministry. Social politics, though certainly the duty of Christians, is not the task of the Church.

(3) The Church has to expound the command of God, not only for the individual, but for the community. It is not its task to develop a programme or points in a programme, but to stir up a social conscience and the confidence that to faith nothing is impossible. It has to make strikingly clear the opposition between industry as it exists to-day and industry in the spirit of Jesus, and to do so without regard to the leaders of *Realpolitik* and without mixing itself in *Realpolitik*. In regard to industry, as we know it, the Church has to sound out clearly and fearlessly its call for repentance, and to show how the evil in industry comes from its Godlessness, and that only through obedience to God's will can there come any real improvement.

(4) The Church as the community of the faithful must show in the world the sign of another spirit and another life. The word of the Church will accomplish little unless in industrial matters also it shows a new life which will at once judge the world and free the world from its despair.

The State.—It is the will of the Creator that men should live, not in isolation but in a community. The State, as we know it, is an instrument of force and compulsion. In this sense it is not a creative ordinance, but an order defined by the fact of sin. 'Every state is an expression of human sin on a grand scale.' 'The State is the product of collective

sin.' Its 'fundamental characteristic is not right but might.' 'Every state maintains and aggrandizes itself by means which in themselves are morally impermissible.' And the ethical problem of the State is 'insoluble.'

On the problem of war, Brunner writes: 'War, that is, the constant readiness of the State to use all the means of force necessary for the objects of its policy, belongs to the essence of the State in so far as it has no better means of defending its right.' 'In principle, unconditioned pacificism is identical with anarchy, with Anabaptist Utopianism.' If we affirm the State as a necessity, we must affirm war as an eventual necessity. Yet in present circumstances, war is suicidal folly. 'The Christian must not live in the past.' In modern circumstances, 'what could be said with some justification in favour of war has lost to-day its validity.' 'War now is identical with the murder of peoples. War has outlived itself. It has become so colossal that it has now no intelligible function.' 'To found the necessity of war on historical thought is to overlook the fact that history has led us to a point in which all analogies from the past have lost their meaning.' 'War has reached a stage of development in which it has no longer any sort of ethical justification.'

'The Christian must take an active part in politics because he learns there, as nowhere else, that we are miserable sinners, who even with the best will cannot do what is truly good.' 'There is no possibility of there being a political programme or a political party, which as such is competent to

put the name "Christian" on its banner. Every form of politics and every political party stands under the judgment of Jesus Christ, and for each the Christian requires the special forgiveness of God. If this were generally recognized even among Christians, political strife would lose its most poisoned sting, and political possibilities would be released which, apart from this, are unthinkable.'

The section concludes with the reminder that 'the State is that divinely appointed ordinance which most clearly shows us that, as the New Testament teaches, we live in an evil world.' 'It is the *meditatio vitae futurae* which makes it possible for a Christian to do his hard duty in the world of politics without becoming hard, and which saves him at the same time from fleeing into refusal of responsibility through fear of having to be hard. It is from this hope that he wins his joy in service and his sobriety in service. And in these two words the whole political ethic of the Christian is included.'

It is obvious that in the limits of one article it has been impossible to do justice to Brunner's massive book. In his emphasis on human sin, Brunner ignores at times unduly the possibilities open to men through the divine grace. Sombre as is the book, it is full of suggestiveness, and is singularly free from the Pharisaic censoriousness and light-hearted idealism which often characterize Christian pronouncements on moral problems. This is a book which ought to be translated.

Literature.

PERSONAL IDEALISM.

In *Christianity and Philosophy* (T. & T. Clark; 10s. 6d. net), Professor D. Miall Edwards, D.D., of the Memorial College, Brecon, Wales, offers us a useful and timely study. In his Gifford Lectures, Dr. Gore expressed the opinion that the present generation (unlike the generation of Augustine or Aquinas) will not enjoy the spectacle of a commonly recognized alliance between religion and philosophy. That opinion is tacitly endorsed in Dr. Streeter's recent Bampton Lectures. Nor would Dr. Edwards gainsay it. But he holds,

rightly, we think, that by the method which Dr. Pringle-Pattison employed of 'construction through criticism' it may be possible to discover the general outlines at least of a philosophy which will at once do justice to man's total experience of the world and serve as an intellectual framework for Christian convictions. Accordingly, in the face of rival philosophies, naturalistic and idealistic, he advances towards a theistic faith expressible in a form of 'personal idealism,' the key to the nature of reality being found in human personal experience, and reality being interpreted in terms of idea or spirit.

Dr. Edwards is obviously widely read in recent theistic literature in English, and his dependence upon previous writers is also obvious. His debt to Principal Galloway might, we think, have been more generously acknowledged. Nor do we agree with Dr. Edwards, as against that writer, that the Transcendent may be regarded as the 'coping-stone' of a unitary theistic system of reality. If the unitary system of reality includes the Transcendent, then the Transcendent is reduced to the Immanent, and a pantheistic cosmology results.

In the ethico-religious argument wherewith Dr. Edwards supplements his study in speculative cosmology, good use is made of the earlier exposition of the value of the Holy or Numinous as the value of values, the converging point of Goodness, Truth, and Beauty, which gathers these other values up into itself and fuses them together in a living synthesis.

Having outlined a theological philosophy with which religion may find alliance, Dr. Edwards proceeds to discuss the more specific form which Theism takes in the Christian religion, dealing with the Christian conceptions of God and Christ. It is in effect a transition from philosophy of religion to Christian dogmatic theology, though the philosophical interest is never left altogether out of account. In Christology proper he would substitute for the traditional distinction of static 'natures' between God and man the distinction of two dynamic personal activities culminating in their perfect ethical confluence in the Person of Jesus Christ.

There are one or two strange misprints in German words in the book, and the phrase, 'a kind of *communicatio idiomatum* of feelings,' makes us pause and wonder.

INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have recently issued a new edition of the *Introduction to the Old Testament*, by Professor John E. McFadyen, D.D., of Trinity College, Glasgow (7s. 6d. net). It is twenty-seven years ago since this book made its first appearance, and, in its old form, it has enjoyed a wide reputation both at home and abroad. The author has subjected the original work to drastic modification in the light of the findings of Old Testament scholarship during the last quarter of a century. It is safe to say that, in the revision now before us, no significant contribution, in English or otherwise, to Old Testament study has been neglected in bringing the Introduction up-to-date.

Its up-to-dateness, indeed, is the most prominent feature of the new edition. The mere citation of the names of the authorities of whose work Dr. McFadyen has taken stock is, in itself, impressive as an indication of the thoroughness of his preparation for this revision: Welch and Hölscher on Deuteronomy; Eissfeldt on the Pentateuch; James Smith, Torrey, and Hölscher on Ezekiel; Torrey on Deutero-Isaiah; Sellin and others on the Servant of Jahweh; Sellin on Job. Besides a thorough study of the work of these men, Dr. McFadyen reveals, in scores of incidental touches—for example, in *The Song of Songs* and *Ecclesiastes*—a competent knowledge of other men's work. It should not, however, be assumed that the new Introduction is a mere collection of other men's views. It is not even a discussion of these, though few scholars in Britain are as competent to carry on such a discussion as Dr. McFadyen. The book is exactly what it purports to be, an Introduction to the Old Testament, which takes into account the results of the most recent scholarship.

The author has followed the plan of the original work in adhering to the Hebrew order of the Books, in selecting their salient features for treatment, and in avoiding excessive detail which the technically trained reader may be expected to know and the general reader (whom Dr. McFadyen has specially in view) would find cumbersome and unhelpful. Within this frame-work noteworthy modifications have been made upon the first edition, especially in the matters of the Prophetic and Priestly documents, of Deuteronomy, of Jeremiah, Habakkuk, and Ezekiel, and of the Servant of Jahweh in Deutero-Isaiah. These modifications are not confined in their scope to mere criticism, but extend sometimes to a fresh consideration and restatement of the contents of the sacred writings, for example, in the survey of Nahum (p. 236).

The general treatment of the subject and the whole temper of this Introduction reveal a thoroughly modern tone combined with a judicious moderation which will commend it to all who are interested in the Old Testament. It admirably displays the completeness of Dr. McFadyen's researches over a long period, and the skill with which he has incorporated the conclusions of recent scholarship commands our deepest respect. Comparing the new edition with the old, one may dimly realize the effort which this revision must have entailed upon the author. The very weight of the additional material—some of it of a refractory nature—must have created for him a problem of presentation and correlation which would have

daunted most men. Yet the problem has been solved. In the new edition there is a unity of conception and of construction wholly adequate to the purpose of the book.

It is not too much to say, indeed, that this *Introduction to the Old Testament* will maintain its unique position among such works, at least in English. It is quite without an equal in its admirable survey of the ground, which is at once comprehensive and clear. Dr. McFadyen has achieved this result by the sanity of judgment which he has exercised in his selection of the outstanding features of the various individual books. In this matter he has exhibited a fine sense of proportion and a flair for the vital issues in each, which give one confidence in the soundness of his treatment. That confidence is increased by the fact that, on almost every page of this book, there is evidence, unobtrusive and frequently unconscious, of a mind that is unable to rest in mere vague generalities and whose judgments are backed by a scholarship as comprehensive as it is meticulously accurate. Dr. McFadyen's style is well suited to his purpose. He has been sparing in his use of words from the Hebrew text (a fact which will commend itself to the reader who does not know Hebrew), and his work is written in language at once lucid and powerful. Indeed, the literary power of the book ensures the reader's sustained interest, and the fine poetic renderings of various illustrative citations from the Old Testament writers form a particularly attractive feature of the work.

Beyond all these things, however, that which draws us most to this book is the passionate reverence which pervades it. This is seen in the devout tone of the discussions, in the high-minded elucidation of the moral and religious situations of the people of Israel, and, above all, in 'that confidence, which can now justify itself at the bar of the most rigorous scientific investigation that, in a sense altogether unique, the religion of Israel is touched by the finger of God' (Preface, p. 10). In keeping with this profoundly spiritual attitude to the literature of the Old Testament is Dr. McFadyen's fine Christian courtesy to all his fellow-workers in the same field. This Introduction is wholly free from any blemish of unseemly polemic. Where the author finds occasion to differ from others, he does so with a courteous restraint and a disarming and genuine recognition of their services to the common cause.

The book 'is written for those who desire to understand the modern attitude to the Old Testament as a whole, but who either do not have the

time or the inclination to follow the details on which all thorough study of it must rest.' Dr. McFadyen's revision has succeeded in preserving this aim. In carrying it out, he has set in a clear light the abiding worth of the Old Testament for the men of this generation. The new *Introduction* has the unique merit of making this part of our spiritual heritage more than ever intelligible to the inquiring intelligence. It is a book calculated not only to enlighten our minds, but to enrich our spirits, and above all to confirm our faith in Him in whom all the revelation of God in the Old Testament finds its consummation.

THE THEOLOGY OF CRISIS.

The ablest book that has yet appeared in English on the Barthian Movement has unfortunately been published in America. We say 'unfortunately' because the price is two dollars, which at the present rate of exchange is a very stiff price for a moderately sized volume. The book to which we refer is entitled *Our Concern with the Theology of Crisis*, by the Rev. Walter Lowrie, D.D. (Meador Publishing Co., Boston), and contains the Bohlen Lectures for 1932. The writer is not a mere student of Barth who gives us at second-hand an account of his teaching. He is himself a thinker of distinction who finds the theology of the Barthian school congenial to his mind and has been steeped in it for years. Having been chaplain in Rome for a quarter of a century, he has gained a wide and thorough knowledge of the religious thought of the Continent, and is able to set the Barthian theology in the environment of wider movements. But the main distinction of his book is that he is a fervent preacher of the Theology of Crisis, and not a critical or calmly dispassionate exponent of it. The Theology of Crisis is 'our concern,' as the title indicates, and this is pressed upon the reader with insistence and power, as it was pressed upon the students to whom the lectures were first given. Rarely have we met with a book so personally searching and so home-coming, and the reader will be insensible indeed who can evade its challenge.

CANON STREETER ON CHRIST AND BUDDHA.

We have travelled far from the time when Canon Liddon delivered his Bampton Lectures on 'The Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,' and the present Lectures by Canon Streeter, on *The Buddha and the Christ* (Macmillan; 7s. 6d.

net), may be taken as a measure of the distance. When Canon Bampton provided for 'Eight Divinity Lecture Sermons' to be preached at St. Mary's in Oxford 'upon the Articles of the Christian Faith, as comprehended in the Apostles' and Nicene Creed,' he can hardly have conceived it possible that under the auspices of that lectureship Christ would be set in the same category as Buddha. This, in essence, is what Canon Streeter does. 'Christ was a carpenter, the Buddha was a prince; they experienced life from different angles. The Buddha was a philosopher, Jesus had the mind of a poet. They thought and spoke in different modes. Each for the sake of miserable humanity made the supreme sacrifice—the Christ in submitting to death, the Buddha by consenting to live.' As a study in comparative religion the work is admirable. Canon Streeter is, as always, clear, interesting, and thought-provoking. The first lecture, on 'Science and Religion,' restates the position previously set forth in the writer's book on 'Reality,' that besides the quantitative measures of physical science there are measures of quality and value which provide avenues of approach to the real. In the next three lectures an elaborate comparison is drawn between Buddha and Christ, and the parallel developments of Buddhism and Christianity. The fifth lecture deals with the subject of how primitive magical elements have been gradually eliminated from religion, philosophy, and science. The last three lectures discuss the solutions which have been offered by Buddhism and Christianity to the problems of Pan, the relation of Action and Ideal, and Immortality. In an appendix there is a short but penetrating criticism of Otto's conception of the numinous. While the excellence of Canon Streeter's work deserves the highest praise, the general impression left on the reader's mind is that what the world needs is an eclectic theosophy which shall combine the best in Buddhism and Christianity, and this is perhaps the most subtle danger threatening the Christian faith in our time.

THE JEWISH BACKGROUND OF CHRISTIANITY.

Every student of early Christianity is aware of its immense debt to Judaism and will be prepared to accord a special welcome to an exposition of its Jewish background from the pen of one who, while himself a Christian, has, by inheritance and early training as a Jew, an inner understanding of that Judaism which began to assume a definite shape

in the two or three centuries before the Christian era. Such an exposition has been offered to us by the Rev. N. Levison, B.D., in *The Jewish Background of Christianity* (T. & T. Clark; 5s. net), the contents of which fully justify the sub-title, 'A Manual of the Political, Religious, Social, and Literary Life of the Jews from 586 B.C. to A.D. 1.'

A brief sketch of the history during that period of political and religious ferment is followed by an account of some of the significant books in the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical literature, the Mishnah and the Talmuds. There are also chapters on Feasts, Fasts, and the Sabbath, and on Parties and Personalities that influenced the period, which happily includes not only the familiar scribes, Pharisees, Sadducees, and Philo, but the less well-known groups of Samaritans, Galileans, Zadokites, Essenes, and others, while among the personalities is Hillel. On all these themes Mr. Levison has much that is interesting to say, and very especially on the Passover which he discusses at length, raising the question whether the Last Supper was a Passover meal, and answering it by saying that it was 'in one sense only, in so far as it may have had a paschal lamb as part of it.' It was, he thinks, analogous rather to the fellowship meal at which scholars used to engage in religious discussion: in reality Jesus anticipated the Passover in the face of the certainty of His own death.

Perhaps the interest of the average reader will be attracted more particularly by the chapters on 'The Religious Background' and 'Public and Family Life and Worship.' In the former, among other things, the influence of Zoroastrianism upon Judaism is discussed, and the latter contains much interesting information on the position of women, on engagements and marriages and on the synagogue. Mr. Levison is a man of independent judgment; he is not afraid to speak a good word for Antiochus Epiphanes and Herod the Great, or to say that 'far too much has been made of Ezekiel's legislative prowess,' or that 'the scribes did much for the nation which most Christians either do not know of at all or do not realise fully.' Also he maintains that at a far earlier period than most scholars allow 'the people generally believed in immortality'; indeed, that 'it was so well established as a belief that it was a hindrance to the people rather than a help.'

Naturally in the course of such a discussion there are points that one might challenge; as, for example, when the writer says: 'I do not wonder that Christians cannot find God in the Old Testament, a God that is personal, a God who is Father.'

But surely, though the references to the Fatherhood of God are admittedly very few, Christians do find in the Old Testament a personal God: indeed, it is largely in the words of the Psalms that we have learned to address God, and perhaps there is no book in the world that conveys so overwhelming an impression of the personality of God as the Old Testament. But this saying only illustrates Mr. Levison's determination to exercise his own judgment and go his own way, and this quality constitutes part of the interest of his well-informed and useful book.

MUHAMMADANISM.

Muhammadanism, being the religion of at least an eighth of humanity, has the right to demand one's study. Moreover, like most things in this dizzying age when nothing will stay settled, it, too, is in a stage of transition and unrest. Among its adherents there are those who are restating it, and those who are attacking Christianity with a new vehemence and venom, and some who, feeling that to concede moral pre-eminence to Jesus Christ would be fatal to their own faith, are seeking to belittle Him with a snarling jealousy. And into all this, new missionaries are sent, often with little accurate knowledge of the religion and the mental attitude of those to whom they are to preach, or how to state their own so as to be likely to be helpful. Happily the Rev. L. Bevan Jones, B.A., B.D., has written a book of over three hundred pages (S.C.M.; 10s. 6d. net), *The People of the Mosque*, which is designed to help them and the general public. It is a work that comes out of a long experience—scholarly, sympathetic, and tactful. A sketch of Muhammad, and of the early history of his faith—its creed and its religious practices, its sects and its mystics, its beginnings and progress in the Far East, and so on—leads to a description of Muhammadanism in the modern world, and so to India and the currents of Muslim thought now running there—its weaknesses and its strength; and how to state the Christian message so as to avoid Muslim prejudices, and meet Muslim needs, and win the Muslim mind. A book that should prove useful.

THE MUSLIM CREED.

Creams are not composed in a vacuum. They are struck out to define and defend truth against the onslaught of opponents from without and erring and mistaken folk within. Their articles are

trenches cut and held against definite heresies, paths prepared for unwary feet lest those stumble or stray amid a maze of false or of inadequate opinions all too current. So it has been in every religion; and among others in Muhammadanism.

There are books on Muslim Dogmatics, like MacDonald's admirable 'Muslim Theology.' But Professor A. J. Wensinck of Leiden, observing that there is no comprehensive study of the historical development of Muslim dogmatics, has supplied the want in a masterly treatise, *The Muslim Creed: Its Genesis and Historical Development* (Cambridge University Press; 15s. net). It is not easy to see how the thing could have been better done, and the result is a work of first-rate scholarship, which sets down in convenient form the researches and results of a finished expert in a field where few could find their way without his help. The Koran itself gives no compendium of faith that could serve as a characteristic description of Islam. For the earliest types of Confessions of Faith and the beginnings of Creeds we must come to the Tradition—the Logia Muhammadis—and even there it is slowly and haltingly that the way is felt to the second phrase of the famous Shahāda, 'There is no God but God, and Muhammad is his prophet.' But soon crucial questions obstinately obtrude themselves, and are discussed, and different sects had differing opinions, and decision must be given, and an orthodox finding reached and stated. Is faith sufficient without works? Is man a puppet, or the author of his acts? And if he is under a scheme of strict predestination, how can he be justly punished for his sins?

Puritans differ from people of slack views, and Rationalists claim for man a great place in the scheme of things. And slowly orthodoxy forms itself, deciding in this way or that, in each and every controversy as it rises. Later come definite Creeds. The brief Fikḥ Akbar I. almost ultra-evangelical on Faith and Works, with no article on the Unity of Allah, and no mention of Muhammad, though the eighth article, out of the ten, reads, 'Whoso believeth all that he is bound to believe, except that he says I do not know whether Moses and Jesus (peace be upon them) do or do not belong to the Apostles, is an infidel.' Later, there is the elaborate Waṣīyat Abī Ḥanīfa, in which things have advanced into a much more theological region. And later still, the Fikḥ Akbar II. and then the III., by which time we have reached an intellectualism, even scholasticism, much and growingly akin to that of Christian Europe. The Commentaries on these various Creeds, given us

article by article, are of great interest and value, both dogmatic and historical; while the chapter on Later Developments, with its summaries of those old-world discussions of the roots of knowledge, and the roots of religion, is an almost daunting proof that there is no new thing under the sun. This is a valuable, if specialized, work.

EXPERIMENTAL ANALYSIS OF DEVELOPMENT.

It must have been an unusual chance under which a copy of this translation of Professor Bernhard Dürken's well-known work 'Grundriss der Entwicklungsmechanik' drifted into the office of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES—perhaps due to a sentence in the translators' Preface, in which they state that 'from the real difficulty presented by *Mehrleistung* we were able to escape only by using a theological equivalent—"supererogation"—which, it is feared, may be less familiar to the younger generation of readers than it is to us.' Nevertheless in the brilliant philosophical handling of the conclusions of his work in experimental embryology, Professor Dürken expounds much that will be of interest to the readers of this magazine.

His theory of development, for example, is very far removed from the materialistic conceptions of a past generation, and is more akin to those modern views that tend to suggest an organic category more fundamental than anything in physics and chemistry. This becomes more and more apparent as the argument of the book develops. 'What supports the entire process of development is not the individual cell but the germ as a whole' (p. 67)—a passage that should make good reading for the author of that great work on 'Holism.' The formative movements function as a whole, in spite of the subdivision of the developing germ into many cells. The fact that parts of an organism that have been lost or mutilated can be regenerated indicates that the 'power to develop has not been lost by the fully developed adult organism' (p. 99)—a power that varies naturally with the place on the scale of life occupied by the organism in question. The potency of any area in a developing organism, that is to say, is greater than the normal performance, and so manifests a certain indeterminateness (p. 115). There is, he concludes, nothing of a preformational character about development; on the contrary, it involves 'the production of new manifoldness' (p. 158), and is a process showing much more freedom than could preformation. 'What is inherited is not simply

discrete carriers of individual characters, but a whole reaction-basis containing definite factors which react in a definite way with the internal and external factors' (p. 163). He has no doubt that 'the environment as a whole, and also its individual factors, intervene in the realization of development' (p. 185), and is particularly interesting in his suggestive modifications of the Neo-Lamarckian point of view. But the main conclusion of the book is to the effect that study of the mechanics of development is increasingly leading away from the mechanistic to 'a really organismic conception of the organism and therefore of life itself' (p. 280). In its marshalling of the data, many of which are original, and its general presentation of this attitude to the fundamental problem of biology, Professor Dürken's volume stands unrivalled at the present moment. It has been translated by H. G. and A. M. Newth, and the publishers are Messrs. Allen & Unwin (14s. net).

MODERN PHYSICS.

An English translation of *Atom and Cosmos*, by Professor Hans Reichenbach of Berlin, has been prepared with commendable promptitude by Professor Edward S. Allen, and published by Messrs. Allen & Unwin (8s. 6d. net). The work was originally delivered as broadcast talks in Germany, and it speaks volumes for the intellectual keenness of the German people that lectures of this quality should be listened to with interest over the wireless and gain a wide popularity in book form. Professor Reichenbach has not the artistic touch of Eddington nor his brilliant play of fancy, but his exposition is admirably clear, and he has been highly successful in bringing the mysteries of modern physics within the comprehension of the lay mind. In particular, his exposition of the theories of Schrödinger and Heisenberg relative to the constitution of the atom is the clearest we have yet seen. Incidentally it might be remarked that popular writers and preachers who have caught the idea that the atom is a microscopic model of the solar system should make haste to learn that such language, always inaccurate, is now quite out of date. In treating of the philosophic consequences of the Quantum Theory, Professor Reichenbach has a really fine discussion of Causality and Probability. It has been found that 'what happens is not predetermined in all details, as determinism, distorting world history into the mechanical performance of a clock movement, maintains; the course of all events is much more like a continual

game of dice, so that each separate step corresponds to a new throw.' While not holding that the questions connected with the freedom of the will have yet been answered, he concludes: 'It is of crucial importance that the solid barrier which determinism erects around every non-deterministic solution of the problem of life and freedom has fallen, that we can no longer speak of objective predetermination of the future, and that the concept of possibility and of becoming takes on an entirely new aspect when we no longer need regard it as an illusion due to human ignorance, as a mere substitute for the description of real and objectively existing facts, which are only subjectively withheld from us human beings.'

THE RELICS OF THE SAINTS.

The Treasure of São Roque (S.P.C.K.; 8s. 6d. net), by Mr. W. Telfer, M.A., Fellow of Clare College, Cambridge, sounds like a romance of adventure, whereas its aim is to present an unpublished collection of sixteenth-century deeds authenticating records of saints, and thus to throw a side-light on the Counter-Reformation. It has been approved as an exercise for the B.D. degree at Cambridge, and published by the Church Historical Society as one of its series of monographs.

The starting-point of the book was an inquiry into the cultus of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, whose reputed skull (the gift of Don Juan de Borgia) is preserved among the relics in the Church of São Roque, Lisbon. The deeds of authentication, about eighty in number, which are here presented, of which one refers to the skull of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, were rediscovered some thirty years ago in a tin box lying in a cupboard in the corridors of the Casa da Misericórdia. This is a group of buildings on the brow of one of the 'seven hills' of Lisbon where, on a site once belonging to the ancient Brotherhood of St. Roch, a scheme of philanthropic activity has its centre. The tin box has survived the revolution in Portugal, and Mr. Telfer had little difficulty in discovering it for himself under a shelf in the muniment room of the Casa.

To understand the contents of the tin box we should know the history of the efforts made by the Jesuit Fathers who founded the Misericórdia at Lisbon to enrich their church with relics. This history Mr. Telfer gives us, calling particular attention to the Borgia donation of 1588, whereby the relics of São Roque became famous. The deeds of authentication connected with the Borgia

donation form the most important element in the contents of the box under investigation.

In his 'Traité des Reliques' Calvin attacked the cult of relics. The sting of the tract lay in its denial of genuineness to large numbers of relics exposed for veneration. The counter-reformers met the attack by ignoring it. The Tridentine canon which deals with relic cultus is designed not to settle questions of authenticity, but rather to regulate the practice of piety towards relics. These are assumed to be authentic if they have been in receipt of veneration; they must, however, be carefully and punctiliously handled and richly housed. The effect was to enhance the sanctity of relics, and thereby to stimulate the church life of the Roman Catholic believer.

We commend this able and learned work as a contribution of a new kind to the study of ecclesiastical history.

THE TRADITIONAL THEORY OF REVELATION.

Religion and Revelation (S.P.C.K.; 4s. 6d. net), by Canon A. L. Lilley of Hereford, from whose pen contributions are always welcome, contains the six lectures delivered in 1931 on the Lecture Foundation established in the General Theological Seminary of New York in memory of Bishop Paddock. An introductory summary has been prefixed to the lectures and an explanatory chapter added. The book is described by the author as a study of 'some moments' in the effort of Christian Theology to define the relations of Religion and Revelation. It is his own personal opinion that on the one hand the symbolism of Revelation has a fully rational character, and on the other hand every authentic deliverance of the reason about the Divine Nature has been attained through a kind of divination rather than as a result of a purely logical or metaphysical process.

The first part of the book recalls the Thomist metaphysical tradition as to the nature and method of Revelation, and the modifications of that tradition introduced by the sixteenth-century Reformers, especially Calvin. Then is considered the seeming challenge of the older views of Revelation on the part of modern Biblical Criticism, and the Barthian theology is commended as actually showing a tendency to regard the results of criticism as helpful to the true view of Revelation. In place, however, of the traditional theory of a unique but exclusive Divine Revelation given in the Scriptures, Canon Lilley advocates a theory in

which there is affirmed not only a largely human element in all Revelation, but also the revelational character of *all* Religion.

It is a small book, but an able and weighty contribution to an important subject.

THE ART AND LIFE OF BYAM SHAW.

Measured in length of years, Byam Shaw's life was very short. But life should not be measured in mere length of years but in terms of accomplishment. In this respect Mr. Shaw's life was a long and prolific one. Few artists have executed works with such rapidity and of such high standard. From the age of twenty-one, when his first picture was exhibited in the Royal Academy in 1893, to the time of his death in 1919 he had thirty-five large and elaborate works exhibited there. A tremendous achievement!

His work was famous for its versatility. As an illustrator of books he published over one thousand drawings; he was represented every year in almost every Art Exhibition of note. He painted in oil, water colour, and in tempera. He drew in pen and ink, pencil and pastel. He executed etchings and drypoints, and in addition he published stained-glass designs, wall paintings, cartoons, posters, bookplates, theatrical settings, and advertisements.

Now an account of his work, fully illustrated in all these various aspects, has been compiled by his friend, Mr. Rex Vicat Cole, in a handsome quarto volume, two hundred and thirty-eight pages fully indexed and with an immense number of fine illustrations in half-tone. The title of the book is *The Art and Life of Byam Shaw* (and the publishers are Messrs. Seeley, Service & Co. (21s. net).

A collection of speeches made by Lord Irwin during the five momentous years—1926–31—when he was Viceroy of India has been prepared by an editor who prefers to remain anonymous, and published by Messrs. Allen & Unwin under the title *Indian Problems* (12s. 6d. net). The progress of events in India has been and continues to be so rapid that Lord Irwin's speeches at various dates to the Legislative Assembly, the Chamber of Princes, and the Chambers of Commerce, read like something out of date, just as the able and, as it seemed, epoch-making Report of the Simon Commission is now regarded. They have this importance, however, that they are all alike inspired by the desire to lead up to an agreed settlement on an

advanced programme of local and legislative control of the greatly complicated affairs of our Indian Empire, with its seemingly irreconcilable Muslim and Hindu races and religions. It happens that there is an admirable epilogue to the Indian speeches in the Massey Lecture which Lord Irwin delivered in 1932 at Toronto University. In this address the late Viceroy sets forth the history of India and explains the complexity of the problem now confronting us. He says: 'We are still learning, as we come closer to the implications of what we wish to do.' But we can now feel tolerably certain that the most inclusive, balanced, and logical method of advance lies in some form of federation of all-India, within the polity of the British Commonwealth.' What seems remarkable in these addresses is something they do not contain, namely, any reference to the influence of Christian missions throughout the whole era of British control in India.

Mr. R. H. Tawney, author of 'The Acquisitive Society,' and other books, has now given us *Land and Labour in China* (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net). Most of the volume was originally written as a memorandum for the Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations, held at Shanghai in November 1931. The book discusses social conditions in China, and problems of industrialism and farming. The likeness to conditions in India is very striking, and perhaps nowhere more than in the chapter on 'Politics and Education.' The Chinese peasant, like the Indian, is, if we take his circumstances into account, a highly skilled farmer; but, like the Indian farmer, he works under heavy handicaps. The average size of a farm is 3·6 acres, the actual size in some parts approximating 1 acre. Food requirements alone require 2½ acres per family of five individuals. The Chinese farmer, like the Indian, is staggering under a crushing burden of debt; and co-operative credit, which has in some measure eased the load in India, seems in China to be hardly in its infancy. Famine, civil war, banditry, and epidemic disease take a terrible toll of the population. As is the case, though perhaps to a less extent, in India, a very large proportion of China's industries is in the hands of foreigners. The change from the old industrial order to the new has, in China as in other countries, given rise to appalling conditions, which attempts are being made to overcome. Mr. Tawney thinks that China's political disorders are characteristic not of a country but of a phase of civilization from which other countries have painfully emerged. China

needs more men like Mr. Leonard Outerbridge, who has done such excellent work in providing suitable seeds for her dry areas.

An Idealist View of Life, Professor S. Radhakrishnan's Hibbert Lectures (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net) will be the most popular of all his writings. His gifts have been well known for years. But in such a work as his 'Indian Philosophy' his subject is so huge and many-sided that, in spite of the two large volumes, he has to condense and compress; has the same difficulty as Angelo with his David. The block of marble is barely sufficient for the figure to be cut from it. But in this volume, though the subject is again a large and many-sided one, he gives himself more elbow room. And all his powers have freer scope and play. This suggestive mind unrolling itself, with a winsomeness of style, and a fullness of knowledge of both European and Indian literature and philosophy that are really amazing, and a most enviable aptness in quotation of things always fresh and at first hand, gives us a fascinating book that sweeps one on in rapid currents through most interesting country. On every page there is a rattle of short, pointed sentences—rapid as machine-gun fire—that makes one think, and opens up new vistas.

And if the confident half-truth seems to be used fairly commonly, there is no page that does not keep the reader on the alert. A very vivid sketch of the modern challenge to religion, and of proposed substitutes for religion, leads on to able disquisitions on the fact and worth of religious experience and its affirmations, on the value of intuitive knowledge, on matter, life, and mind, on human personality and its destiny, and the like. Arresting in itself, the book has an added interest through being written by an Indian, revealing, as it does unconsciously, how once again Hindu thought is absorbing much from its rival faith, this time Christianity. For while this Catholic mind is very loyal to Indian beliefs—he dismisses personal immortality in a single and slighting half-page, as evidently quite unworthy of serious discussion—none the less the influence of Western, and especially Christian, thought, seems evident enough. It is, indeed, an absorbing study to note what the old Indian thought means to a cultured modern Indian mind; and not less how that last reacts to what is characteristically Christian. This is a really fascinating book that should have many readers.

A study of George Fox on original lines will be

found in *The Man of Fire and Steel*, a collective study of George Fox, edited by Mr. John S. Hoyland (James Clarke; 3s. 6d. net). The book is the outcome of an educational experiment. In 1931 a class of ten students of six different countries set to work to study the Journal of George Fox. The proceedings were conducted very much in the 'Study Circle' fashion, and out of the reports and discussions of the group Mr. Hoyland has fashioned this excellent monograph. Different aspects of Fox himself and his religious life are presented; and, at the time when 'Oxford Groupers' are in evidence, such features of the Friends' experience as 'guidance' and 'the inner light' are particularly interesting. The book will repay careful reading, and is well adapted for group discussion.

The Crown of Character, by the Rev. John Burr, M.A. (James Clarke; 2s. 6d. net), is a study of the Beatitudes of our Lord. So much has been written on the Beatitudes that it is very difficult, and, for most of us, impossible to say anything fresh. Yet the ideal of Christian character must be upheld and expounded; and to this task the present writer has given much thought and ability. Without attaining to anything lofty and original, he discourses wisely and pleasantly, illuminates his points with apt illustrations, and adorns his pages with a number of well-chosen poetical quotations.

Mr. Bruce Barton, author of 'The Man Nobody Knows' and of 'The Book Nobody Knows,' both of which have sold by the ten thousand, has now given us a book on St. Paul—*He Upset the World* (Constable; 3s. 6d. net). It is fairly safe to predict a large sale for this book also. Formerly Mr. Barton did not like Paul, his manners, his theology, or his style; but, being urged by his favourite editor and various friends to write a book on Paul, he decided to re-read the Acts and the Pauline Epistles, and is now an enthusiast for Paul. He says that nearly all previous books on Paul are dull. No one will find this book dull. The style is exceedingly vivid, and the book makes the man Paul a very live and modern person indeed. If Mr. Barton can induce a large circle of readers to study the Apostle Paul with a new and friendly interest, it will be a notable achievement, and it is not too much to hope that his book will accomplish this.

Mr. Barton does not profess to have anything new to say of Paul, and he is frankly writing for somewhat uncritical readers; but one wonders whether, even so, he has not allowed himself to be

carried too far by a desire to find romance in the New Testament, on insufficient evidence or on no evidence. He knows that Saul changed his name to Paul; that the young man 'who left the linen cloth and fled from them naked' was Mark; that the Sosthenes who was beaten in Corinth was the Sosthenes of 1 Co 1¹; and that the beating did Paul's heart good; that Priscilla was a good cook and motherly, and that Paul was beheaded by Nero in Rome in the year 71. The chapter on Paul's sufferings is headed 'Taking it on the Chin,' and the title of the last chapter is 'The Journey into Spain.' But whether Paul is preached by methods of which we approve or by other methods, it is all to the good that Paul should be preached, and this book will find a public.

It was fitting that the publication of *The New Testament and its Transmission*, by Professor George Milligan, D.D., D.C.L. (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net), should synchronize with Professor Milligan's demission of the Chair of Divinity and Biblical Criticism in Glasgow University. This book contains the substance of the Baird Lectures for 1929-30, and in a sense it may be said to sum up the life-work of the Professor. The volume is a delight to handle and to read; and the contents, while the work of a reverent scholar who loves his work, are such as all can read and appreciate. Here we are introduced, in non-technical language, to the papyri and the parchments, to the Greek Manuscripts, to the ancient versions, the critical editions of the Greek New Testament and the early English versions. There is a separate lecture on the Authorized and Revised Versions and the later translations of the New Testament, with a note on the doctrinal significance of the Revised Version. Dr. Milligan does not think the time is ripe for a new revision.

A glossary, a bibliography, and some special notes greatly add to the usefulness of the volume. The facsimiles include a page of the Codex Sinaiticus and a page of the Sinaitic Syriac Palimpsest. May this volume, in which Dr. Milligan has so successfully sought to make the fruits of his ripe scholarship available for all lovers of the Bible, have as many readers as it deserves.

Professor W. P. Paterson's Baird Lectures on *The Rule of Faith* have long been a standard work. Now after twenty years of steady popularity a fourth and enlarged edition has been published (Hodder & Stoughton; 8s. 6d. net), which, it may be confidently expected, will give authoritative

guidance to yet another generation of students. The most important feature of this new edition is a chapter which has now been added on Movements of the Twentieth Century. In it Professor Paterson gives a survey of the Modernist movement in its relation to Rome and to Canterbury, of the schools of Troeltsch and Barth in Germany, of doctrinal activity in the Presbyterian Churches, and of the irenical pronouncements of the Lausanne Conference on Faith and Order.

Mr. J. S. Boughton has not been too happy in his choice of a title for his treatise in calling it *The Idea of Progress in Philo Judæus* (Jewish Publication Society of America; \$1.50). It is really a very scholarly and valuable account of the great Jewish philosopher's main work. It is in three parts: Materials, Methods, and Motives of Philo as a Thinker; Theosophy and Psychology; Teleology.

An admirable book on the question of Sunday observance has been written by an anonymous London journalist, *Why Sunday?* (Lutterworth Press; 1s. net). The writer is no puritan, or killjoy, or Pharisee. He is a broad-minded observer who has come to the conclusion that the present craze for pleasure and easy money is one of the greatest dangers of our time. He regards the Sunday, properly used, as one of the bulwarks of national health and sanity. He is against gloomy restrictions, but he is perfectly definite in his desire for the preservation of the day for its physical and spiritual values. Those who agree with this standpoint will find in the book a perfect armoury of weapons for controversy. It is one of the best books on the subject we have seen. There is an admirable preface by Sir W. C. Oman, K.B.E.

Mr. Rufus M. Jones is widely known as a writer of deep thoughtfulness and spirituality. Being appointed member of a Commission to inquire into the religious situation in the Orient he suggested to his fellow-members that a beginning should be made with an inquiry into the state of Christianity at home. With their encouragement he prepared the volume now issued, *A Preface to Christian Faith in a New Age* (Macmillan; 10s. net). After surveying the difficulties and hindrances to Christian faith in our time he proceeds to a re-examination of the spiritual foundations. Thereafter he leads on to a more direct approach to the heart of Christianity through the testimony of human experience. Here, it may be said, he

appears to rely too exclusively on the mystical type of experience, much of which is not distinctively Christian. In the concluding part of the book he treats of the nature and mission of the Church, and of the new emphasis on the religious element in education. This last chapter on education, though full of good things, is plainly addressed to the American situation and stands in somewhat loose connexion with the main argument of the book.

We observe that a new edition has been published of Mr. Alex. Pallis's *Notes on St. Mark and St. Matthew* (Milford; 3s. net). Mr. Pallis, who is of Greek origin, has written a number of works both in Greek and in English, his publications in English being principally notes on books of the New Testament. It appears to be a major position of this writer that all the primitive Scriptural works, whether canonical or apocryphal, were composed in Greek by authors whose mother tongue was Greek.

The Resurrection of Jesus, by Selby Vernon McCasland, Professor in Goucher College (Nelson, New York; \$2.00), is 'a new study of the belief that Jesus rose from the dead, of its function as the early Christian cult story, and of the origin of the gospel literature.' The book shows evidence of hard work and extensive research, but it is vitiated by a dogmatism and prejudice that are to-day much rarer in such studies than they were. In the preface the author professes to use solely the scientific method of experimental verification, and proceeds at once to announce that scientific thought has discarded the supernatural, and that the scientific method is recognized as the only valid method of attaining truth. It is therefore imperative that it be applied to the field of religion. It is not surprising after this to find the phrase 'there can be no doubt' applied to the most disputable statements, or to find that the author calmly accepts parts of the gospel story that suit him. The whole investigation is reminiscent of a previous age when rationalism was rampant and self-confident. And perhaps in some circles in America they have not yet got past that stage.

A third volume of sermons by the Rev. Joseph Pearce, *The Upper Gate*, is issued by the Orphans' Printing Press, Leominster (3s. 6d. net). Mr. Pearce has been incited to this fresh publication by the reviewers and by hundreds of letters of acknowledgment from people who have been bene-

fited. Who could resist such an army of encouragers? It must be said, however, that the present book quite justifies these good people. The sermons are excellent in every way. Mr. Pearce is never dull, he illuminates his themes by well-judged literary quotations, and the spirit of the discourses is always earnest and moving. The Ordination Address at the end of the volume on 'The Wonder of the Ministry' is so good that it deserves to be issued as a tract for ordinands.

Grace and Power, by Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas (Pickering & Inglis; 2s. 6d. net), is designed to set forth 'the possibility, provision, and protection of the Christian life.' Dr. Thomas has rather a weakness for alliterative headings, though some of them are striking and memorable. His teaching is in the fullest sense Biblical. It is savoury meat, rich in scriptural quotations and allusion. It moves in the green pastures and by the still waters, far from the rush and babble of modern problems. For quiet devotional reading the book may be warmly commended.

Sermons in a College Chapel are generally on a high level, but those preached in the Chapel of Victoria University, Toronto, last year have a special interest and value. They are the result of a genial conspiracy among four of the Professors, the Chancellor, and one outside minister (the Rev. Richard Roberts) to set forth in a systematic way the essentials of the Christian Faith. The title, *A Faith for To-Day*, is the same as Dr. R. J. Campbell chose for one of his most arresting books. Perhaps it is not correct to say that the sermons in this volume aim at a systematic presentation. At any rate, each of the preachers has a great theme and endeavours to justify faith in a way that will appeal to the modern student. The subjects are 'The Faith of a Christian,' 'Faith in God,' 'Faith in Christ,' 'Faith in Man,' 'Faith in the Spirit of God,' and 'Faith and the Future'; and the preachers were Dr. E. W. Wallace, the Rev. John Macleod, the Rev. John Line, Dr. John Dow, Dr. J. Hugh Michael, and Dr. Richard Roberts. The longest, and it seems to us the ablest, of these discourses is that on 'Faith in Christ,' and if it is not entirely satisfactory from the dogmatic standpoint, it is, at any rate a remarkably intelligent attempt to translate the essential truth about the Divine Saviour into terms acceptable to the modern mind, and the aim of the whole course must be kept in view. Dr. Wallace's sermon on 'The Faith of a Christian' is another most admirable statement

which must have helped the student audience to grasp what Christianity stands for. Another of the addresses we have given in 'The Christian Year' this month, in slightly abridged form. We welcome these apologetic essays for what they attempt to do for young inquiring minds, and hope that their influence may be extended in this more permanent form. The book is published by the Ryerson Press, Toronto.

With the idea of securing an intelligent and sympathetic approach to Islam, Dr. Frank Hugh Foster has written *A Brief Doctrinal Commentary on the Arabic Koran* (Sheldon Press; 3s. net). He adopts Nöldeke's arrangement of the Suras, which enables readers to follow the development of Muhammad's thought. This little book makes it sufficiently clear that, great as Muhammad undoubtedly was, he was anything but a systematic thinker. He was essentially an ethical reformer, so inspired with a passion for monotheism that he was uniformly hostile to the Christian doctrine of the Trinity, as well as to the Christian worship of the saints; the features of the good life which appeal to him are prayer, generosity, responsibility, self-control. An interesting feature of the book is that the key-words of the Qur'an are given in Arabic as well as in English, but this in no way interferes with the pleasure of the reader who is innocent of Arabic. Dr. Foster has written his book in the belief that, if adherents of other religions are to be won for Christianity, their own religion must be approached sympathetically by people who really understand it. This book, unencumbered with irrelevant learning, is a real contribution to that approach, so far as it concerns Islam.

Belief in God is fundamental, but so is belief in man. So says Mr. Philip S. Richards in *Belief in Man* (S.P.C.K.; 7s. 6d. net). This is a big book on what might seem a small topic. But it is by no means small. Mr. Richards joins issue with Naturalism in its assertion that man is simply a part of Nature, that the difference between man and the lower animals is one of degree and not of kind. If this be true, the author says, the cause of humanism is lost. That is his theme, and in eight well-reasoned chapters he hits his nail on the head again and again. The chapters are on The Limits of Evolution, Morality, Reason, Art, Beauty, Religion, the Classics, and Christianity. Man is a Real Kind—that is the truth that lies at the heart of his greatness. Otherwise he is as the

beasts that perish. This is a really fine book, with a contribution that goes to the very heart of reality. Canon Quick furnishes an appreciative preface in which he dots the author's i's.

A book that is fine in spirit and able in treatment on a great theme is *The Spirit of the Living God* (S.P.C.K.; 2s. 6d. net). It contains addresses given at Cromer Convention in the summer of 1932 by the Archbishop of York, the Rev. R. O. P. Taylor (whose contribution is specially good), Professor C. E. Raven, Archdeacon Storr, and others. The aspects of the subject treated are such as these: the Spirit and Human Personality, the Spirit in the Universe, the Spirit and Worship, the Spirit and Fellowship. The addresses are very helpful throughout. But why does the Archbishop of York refer to the Genesis account of Creation as a myth? A legend certainly, but there is a great difference between a legend and a myth. A myth is a pure creation of the imagination.

Another little volume has been added to that excellent series 'The Churchman's Popular Library.' It is *An Introduction to the Christian Doctrine of God*, by the Rev. Canon W. J. Brown, B.D. (S.P.C.K.; 1s. 6d. net). Not much can be attempted on this great theme in the space available, but the writer has been very successful in giving at least a bird's-eye view. In four chapters he discourses on the Modern Approach to Religion, Grounds of Belief in God, The Biblical Conception of God, and Divine Personality. Written in simple and untechnical language his book is well fitted to instruct the intelligent layman and lead him to a firm and reasonable faith in God.

The five hundred years between Ezra and Christ are a *terra incognita* to most people, and for that reason much of the New Testament remains sealed to them. For these centuries are the background of the New Testament, and you cannot understand the New Testament without a knowledge of what went on during this period, any more than you will understand the situation to-day if you are ignorant of all that has transpired since A.D. 1432. So that *The Forgotten Centuries*, by Mr. G. B. Ayre (S.C.M.; 2s. 6d. net), is a book to be read. It is a handbook for Central, Senior, and Middle Forms of Secondary Schools, but it is really for everybody who wants to understand his Bible. The present book is, however, only an instalment. It furnishes the historical background. The religious develop-

ment is reserved for another volume. But the historical background is absorbingly interesting, and, with such a fascinating subject, no one could be dull. But why reject the traditional account of the origin of the Samaritans in 2 K 17? We are all for being up to date, but the easy acceptance of critical negations is sometimes a mistake. We hope the continuation of this narrative will soon be resumed.

The nephew of 'the great Samuel Butler' (as

he is described on the jacket) has written a book on *The Existence and Immortality of the Soul* (Lincoln Williams; 3s. 6d. net). Mr. H. T. Butler has written for the ordinary man, and he has found his proofs in the Book of Nature. We cannot say that the arguments are conclusive. But we can say that the book is full of all sorts of facts, many of them quaint, many of them interesting, so that it will be no task to read these chapters. The reader will add to his knowledge of the world, even if he does not increase his faith.

Readers of the Ancient Church.

I.

Irenæus of Lugdunum.

BY THE REVEREND F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, D.D., TOLLESHUNT KNIGHTS, ESSEX.

MATERIALS for a Life of Irenæus are meagre. The outline of his life is only given in detached fragments. He reveals himself with the same reserve in his writings. The little that we do know of him, however, makes us eager to find out more about so charming and gifted a personality. It was during the persecution of A.D. 177 that he became Bishop of Lugdunum, succeeding Pothinus, martyred in his ninetieth year. A leading bishop, writer and scholar, he may be fairly described as the first Christian theologian. Dr. Swete's words, 'No Christian writer has deserved better of the whole Church than Irenæus,'¹ would be endorsed by many modern scholars. This verdict, at any rate, is not likely to be greatly affected by the recent laboured attempt of the late Dr. Friederich Loofs to prove that 'Theophilus of Antioch was greater than Irenæus, both as a writer and theologian.'² A fresh zest has been given to the study of Irenæus by this valuable if arbitrary analysis of his sources, based as it is upon a guess of Harnack's that Irenæus gave some references in his

Treatise against all the Heresies and his *Apostolic Teaching* to the lost treatise of Theophilus against Marcion, the dates not permitting them to be to his extant work. Following this thread, Dr. Loofs thought he discovered a great portion of that lost treatise incorporated in the last three books of Irenæus, thus making Irenæus out to be a smaller man than his fame. However, he agreed with Harnack in holding that Irenæus is the first Christian writer we have who undertook the great task of expounding and defending orthodox Christianity in opposition to the gnostic forms. Of course, the fame of Irenæus does not rest only upon his writings, but also upon his great services to the Christian Church as a leader in its counsels, a mediator in its disputes, and a protagonist in its controversies. He had special facilities and unique opportunities for his lifelong labours for the greater comprehensiveness and unity of Christians. His own Christianity, as Dr. Hort observed, 'has a comprehensiveness such as no earlier Christian Father known to us could ever have dreamed of.'³ It was a great matter for the Church that a man of such sweet reasonableness, devotional spirit, and vigorous intellect was located in so many different spheres of work where he could feel and appreciate the tendencies of Christian and anti-Christian thought

¹ Preface to *Irenæus of Lugdunum* (Camb. Univ. Press), by present writer.

² 'Theophilus,' von Antiochien Adversus Marcionem in *Texte und Untersuchungen* (1930), p. 431. This work can be answered, but it would require a separate article.

³ Hort, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, i. 71.

throughout the whole Church, East and West. His testimony represents the Churches of Asia, Rome, and Gaul. He had been brought up in Asia at the feet of Polycarp. In a letter to Florinus, a fellow-pupil of his in his youth, he referred to the time he spent with Polycarp, and the discourses of that saint, and the way he described his intercourse with John and with the rest who had seen the Lord, and related their words. He also spoke of the 'most adequate epistle' of Polycarp to the Philippians. His early associations with that apostolic man alone would make Irenæus an interesting figure in Church history.

In his early manhood he made his way to Rome, where he was evidently a pupil of Justin Martyr. The Moscow postscript of the letter of the Smyrnæans states that when Polycarp was martyred in Smyrna, Irenæus who was then living as a teacher in Rome, heard a voice as of a trumpet saying 'Polycarp has borne testimony.' Lipsius admits that this note may have been contained in one of the lost works of Irenæus. If this is correct, he was a teacher in Rome in A.D. 155, and probably remained there until Justin's martyrdom, A.D. 164, when he took refuge in the south of Gaul. His stay in Rome was most important for the development of his theology. He owed much to Justin, from whose work against Marcion he quoted, whose views on the freedom of man's will, the Messianic reading of Scripture, and seeking for types, eschatology, the Holy Communion, and whose use of the idea of recapitulation, and controversy with Marcion were passed on to him. In Rome he came into contact with the gnostic school of Valentinus, who, he says, came to Rome in the time of Hyginus, flourished under Pius, and remained until Anicetus (A.D. 138-160). He may have met Marcion, who, he says, flourished in Rome under Anicetus, and may have witnessed the meeting of Polycarp and Marcion when the latter asked, 'Do you not recognize me?' and the other replied, 'I know thee for the firstborn of Satan.'

The *Treatise against all the Heresies*, the monumental work by which he is best known to fame, was originally intended to confute the fantastic theories of gnosticism, and to answer the destructive criticism of Marcion. It was during his stay in Rome that he collected his material not only for both controversies, but also for his account of the early history of the Creed, the Canon, and the Episcopate. He had found as he made progress in his studies of the gnostic sects and of Marcion's theories, that he had an even more important work to perform than their confutation.

He realized that he had to address himself to the new problems of the growing faith and the questions which had been raised by these heresies, and to lay the foundations of a systematic Christian theology. So he gave the Church, bewildered by heresies and divided by sects, what it needed, a systematic Christian theology, a constructive definite teaching which in some particulars has never been improved upon, and an *irenicon* for all who called themselves Christians. In Gaul he came under the influence of Pothindus, whose presbyter he became, and afterwards his successor. In this new country he won golden opinions from all sorts of people. His popularity and prominence in the Christian community were shown by his appointment as delegate from the Confessors of Lugdunum to Eleutherus, Bishop of Rome, bearing a letter which introduced him as 'a zealous adherent of the testament of Christ and a presbyter of the Church,' and which was on the subject of the Montanist controversy. During his long residence as bishop among the Keltae of Southern Gaul he almost forgot his Latin and Greek through using the native dialects, he says. In Gaul he had to deal with certain forms of gnosticism, while extending and consolidating Church organization and constructing and formulating its doctrines. We can, therefore, claim that he was a representative theologian of vast and varied experience, and that his literary work as a depository of his personal knowledge of the Church's work, traditions, and teaching is invaluable to the student of Church history.

He was a lover of peace by nature as by name. On many occasions he acted as peacemaker, and prevented schism in the Church and dissension among the brethren, notably in his mediation between the Church of Rome and the Asiatic churches it had threatened to excommunicate, because they held their own views on the Paschal question. He had a lofty sense of the solitary responsibility of the Episcopal order. It was this responsibility that made him so ready to reconcile antagonistic elements in the Church, and to find in the Episcopal succession a safeguard for sound doctrine and Bible truth. He laid down a remarkable principle when discussing the relations of Polycarp and Anicetus of Rome, who differed, but agreed to differ on a question (the Quartodeciman) which troubled the Church at that time.

'This very difference,' he said, 'in the observance of the fast confirms our concord in the faith.' His spirit could soar above the non-essentials into the pure realm of the essentials, the things that matter—Catholic truth, freedom, love, the spiritual

union of all men in God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Accordingly, while maintaining the historic Episcopate on one hand, and sound Bible teaching on the other, he insisted no less upon the spiritual bond of unity formed by love—'love which is more precious than knowledge, more illustrious than prophecy, and more excellent than all other gifts.' His pen seems to glow with indignation when he writes of those who broke up the unity of the Church for which he laboured. To that indignation passages in his writings, which we, who do not love the Church less but Christ more, would not endorse, are to be attributed. For he emphasises the Catholic or universal character of the Church, saying, 'the glorious Church is everywhere because they who receive the Spirit are everywhere.' 'For where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God, and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church. And every form of grace, for the Spirit is truth.' Were Irenæus among us to-day he would be the first to admit that the Holy Spirit had been working in the great Nonconformist bodies even as He has been in the ordered ministry of the historic Churches. The learning, vigour, eloquence, logic, and unction especially of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland would have appealed to him and impressed him, as the graces of a living Church. Although an ardent student of St. Paul's writings, and a great admirer of that Apostle, his mind had a closer affinity to that of the author of the Fourth Gospel, whom he declares was John the disciple of Jesus. For him there was no Johannine problem. In many of his pithy sayings, for example, 'the life of man is the vision of God,' we have that mystical point of view which is so pronounced in his doctrines of God and man, sin and its atonement, Scripture and its exposition. At the same time, it was a mysticism restrained from daring flights by the practical considerations of Church, ministry, and sacraments. It is this mystical turn that makes a voluminous treatise, which is relieved from dullness generally by the quaintness of its conceits, touches of humour, and the aptness of its analogies and metaphors, an inspiring work. Naturally, we expect and find mistakes, as we do in most books. Those of Irenæus are chiefly due to his uncritical acceptance of the statements of men he regarded as authorities in the Church, and whose opinions he would not question, the presbyters to whom he frequently refers, and from one of whom he learned that our Lord lived to fifty years of age! He seems to have been devoted to Papias, who may have led him astray on one point at any rate—Chiliasm. His mind was mystical and synthetical rather than

critical and analytical. He says there are four Gospels and no more, and gives certain mystical reasons why there should be no more and no less than four, such as the four-visaged cherubim, the four winds, and four quarters of the heaven. It is his testimony to the fact that there are four Gospels, and not his explanation of the fact, that possesses value for us. We appreciate the former, and discard the latter.

Whichcote, a Cambridge Platonist, resembled Irenæus not only in the turn of his mind, but also in his expressions. We may compare Whichcote's aphorisms, 'heaven is first a temper, then a place'; 'heaven present is resemblance to God'; with these of Irenæus: 'Obedience to God is immortality,' 'the vision of God confers incorruption,' and 'it is the glory of man to be the servant of God.'

He had a vivid sense of the presence of Christ in his life. His love of his Master was the guiding motive of his life, and his appreciation of the Divinely-human and humanly-Divine personality of that Master is the key to his doctrine. As Harnack said, 'So far as we know at least, he is the first ecclesiastical theologian after the time of the Apologists (see Ignatius before that) who assigned a quite specific significance to the person of Christ.' Among the choicest of the jewels 'five words long' that stud his monumental work are the following: 'The Word became what we are to make us what He is'; 'the Word became man that man might possess the Word'; 'The Son of God became the Son of Man that man might become the son of God'; 'The Father is the Invisible of the Son, while the Son is the Visible of the Father.' His pregnant sentences are often expressed in the form of a *chiasmus*, e.g. 'to men displaying God, to God exhibiting man.'

Irenæus had not the same spiritual depth and fervour as St. Paul, and therefore did not feel the power of the Divine forgiveness in the same way. He did not express the same passionate longings and convictions as St. Augustine, but he had not passed through the same experience. As a Greek he was more inclined to treat sin from an intellectual rather than from an emotional standpoint. We do not find in him the dogmatic precision of Tertullian, the ample scholarship and classical culture of Clement of Alexandria, and the scientific theology of Origen, yet his doctrine founded upon the New Testament—the book he knew best—proved a more decisive factor than all three in the moulding of the historic faith. His was not a creative genius which could start a new line of thought or discover a new principle of

development. He had many teachers, whose superiority he is ever ready to admit, whose lessons he gratefully acknowledges, although he does not always mention their names. Among these were Polycarp, Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Papias, and Loofs would add Theophilus. In his writings we are able to trace the development of the Creed or apostolic faith, the growth of the Canon or apostolic documents, the progress of the Church or the apostolic constitution. Much of the treatise has been superseded; but more has present force. For ancient errors are ever reappearing in new forms. And when we have separated the dross from the pure ore, the gains are not small. From the traditions of the Middle Ages, from scholasticism and metaphysics we are summoned back to the Early Church with its simple majesty, and its martyr spirit—back to the vision of a Christ of infinite power and infinite pity. He survived until about A.D. 202. It is not certain that he suffered martyrdom, although Jerome described him as ‘an apostolic man, bishop, and martyr.’ Gregory of Tours is the first to give an account of a martyrdom which is not mentioned by Augustine, Theodoret, or Cyril. Church historians of every age speak in a chorus of praise of his work and character. Tertullian called him ‘a most careful investigator of every doctrine’; Basil, ‘the successor of the apostles’; Eusebius brackets him with Clement as ‘a man equipped with the gifts of the spirit and furnished with heavenly graces’; while Erasmus declares that ‘his writings breathe the early vigour of the Gospel, and that his speech proveth his readiness for martyrdom.’ The fruits of his pastoral and missionary work are sufficient evidence of the superior quality of the man’s soul. The city of Lugdunum, where a common altar had been raised, and a common festival instituted to wean the Gauls from the Druidical religion, became in the succeeding centuries, through the influence and work of Irenæus, a centre of Christian light and culture. His book translated into Latin, about A.D. 200, according to Dr. Loofs, but probably much later, was studied in the monastery of Lérins, in the south of France, and very probably by St. Patrick of Ireland, whose writings have not a few echoes of its Latin phrases. At the Reformation students of every religious party, Franciscans, Jesuits, Lutherans, Calvinists, searched this treatise for arguments.

Indeed, the controversy between the Romanists and the Lutherans became so hot that Dr. Pfaff, a Lutheran doctor about 1713 made use of some fragments to support his case. These were proved

by Harnack to be forgeries. A minor work in a simpler style is the *Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching* discovered in 1904 in an Armenian translation. This manual was written as an introduction to Christian evidences for a friend, Marcianus. Its authenticity is established by a comparison of it with the last two books of the treatise which were found bound with it. ‘All the chief points of the religious teaching in the *Adversus Haereses* are here,’ said Dr. Harnack. ‘For Irenæus they were not theology, but religion itself.’ The chief object of the tract is to show how Judaism leads up to and proves Christianity. It incidentally throws light upon Irenæus’s doctrine of the Trinity, especially upon the relations of the Son and the Spirit to one another and to the Creation and Incarnation. Chiefly interested in the Incarnation of the Son, Irenæus did not overlook the doctrine of the Spirit. For the first time that doctrine ‘takes its place in an orderly scheme of Christian teaching.’ He ‘enters into the details of the Holy Spirit’s work on the hearts and lives of men with a fulness which is far in advance of other Christian writers of the second century.’¹

The Spirit, he writes, is ‘the ladder by which we ascend to God.’ ‘He prepares man for the Son who leads him to the Father.’ There are many such passages in the Treatise like these. As Augustine in later times found the key to the Trinity in Love, He who loves, the Beloved One, and Love that unites the twain, Irenæus found the solution in the name of Christ. ‘In the name of Christ is implied the Anointer, the Anointed, and the Unction with which the Anointment has been made. It is the Father who anoints, the Son who is anointed and the Spirit who is the Unction.’ From a careful study of the *Apostolic Preaching* one might infer that the Monarchia of the Father is more pronounced than in the Treatise, while the Being and Initiative of the Son assume a unique importance in the economy of creation and man; and furthermore, that the Personality of the Spirit if at times seemingly confused with the Divine Logos becomes more vivid in the tract.² We are therefore, thankful for the discovery of this tract which repeats in simpler language the chief doctrinal statements of the treatise and at times ‘throws further light upon them.’

It was Irenæus’s refutation of gnosticism, especially in the form of Valentinus, and of the system of

¹ Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the Church*, 89.

² An article by present writer in *Hermathena* (1907) pp. 307–337, ‘The Apostolic Preaching of Irenæus and its Light on his Doctrine of the Trinity.’

Marcion which won him his position in the annals of Christianity. The first two books are an examination of the weird and bewildering speculations carried on beneath the cloak of Christianity, but under the name of gnosticism. Its fundamental principle was the unknowableness and transcendence of God implying the complete separation of God from man. This gap they made between God and man was filled up by a scale of intermediaries, variously termed æons, or emanations, *dynamis*, or agencies. The gnostics pretended that they possessed the key that solved all the problems that have perplexed not only men in general, but Christians in particular. The promoters of this 'falsely so-called science' looked down upon the common church people, and offered to the would-be-thought-clever an attractive refuge from the social service of the Church and a welcome escape from the restrictions of its rule of faith. The danger of these early systems like that of similar modern ones, e.g. Christian science and its illusions, Theosophy and its planes, Spiritualism and its communications, Swedenborgianism and its 'correspondences,' which are but revivals of ancient gnostic thought, sometimes presented in Christian dress, consisted not so much in the mass of error they concealed as in the grains of truth they contained. These grains of truth gave vitality and attraction to the miscellaneous medley of speculation, magic, mysticism, and nonsense, of which gnosticism, generally speaking, consisted, and so it became a formidable barrier to the progress of Christian thought among the cultured. To expose and refute the plausible theories and mystifying utterances of the various gnostic sects, Irenæus, like a second St. Paul, buckled on his armour. 'The specious fraud of the heretics,' he writes, 'tricked out with borrowed plumes might easily beguile the more simple people to accept it for truth.' For those of an imaginative turn the Valentinian gnosis held out many inducements; but to those of a more ascetic and practical type the Marcionite *gnosis* made a stronger appeal. Marcion's system was austere. He professed to be purely Christian in his views, borrowing nothing from Greek philosophy or Oriental theosophy on which Valentinus had largely

drawn. He protested against all that savoured of Judaism as well as allegorical interpretation and Church tradition. Valentinus spared the Scriptures, expounding them by his allegorical method. Marcion, like an advanced critic, 'employed a sword rather than a pen,' cutting up the Pauline Epistles to suit his own ideas. In his system the Creator is distinguished from the Supreme God, who is perfectly good; whereas the Creator or Demiurge, an inferior God, is the source of strife, the author of the Old Testament, and the protector of the Jews, whose kingdom he desired to establish. The Supreme God sent the Messiah, who accommodated Himself to Messianic expectations, and proclaimed the Supreme God in an unreal body. The Demiurge, however, incited the Jews against him. The original difficulty of reconciling God's mercy and justice underlay this theory, and turned Marcion so much against the Jewish system and the Old Testament that he kept the Jewish Sabbath as a fast. These systems were exposed by Irenæus in his writings and discourses; and although they were heavily defeated, they were not completely crushed. The Marcionite became the more popular, because of the ascetic character of its founder. Marcionite communities were strong in Egypt, Palestine, and other places in the fourth century, owing to their courage in enduring martyrdom, and were found in Bosnia in 1774; while a revival of the Valentinian heresy under the name of *Église Gnostique* was until quite recently working in Paris and Lyons, and was supported by spiritualists.

The one advantage the Christian Church reaped from her controversies with these heretics was the vital definitions of the faith which they elicited. Irenæus would describe all modern revivers of gnosticism in one telling phrase—'omnes falso scientiæ nomine inflati, Scripturas quidem confitentur, interpretationes vero convertunt.'

This is but a meagre summary of the life and teaching of 'the admirable Irenæus who brought learning, culture, and religion to the tribes of Gaul' (Theodoret), and after a terrible persecution 'in a short time brought the state back to Christianity' (Gregory of Tours).

In the Study.

Virginitibus Puerisque.

The Chained Man.

BY THE REVEREND R. E. THOMAS, M.A.,
BARNET.

'O Lord, thou hast loosed my bonds.'—Ps 116¹⁶.

Not long ago I saw a chained man. No, he was not in a show, or a circus. He was underground, but he was not a convict working in the Siberian mines. He was underground in London, and in a place where many people in London may be found underground every day. He was in a train on the London Underground Railway. But unlike most people on the London Underground Railway, this man was chained. Round his waist he had a chain, a real chain, and a strong chain at that.

As I said, he was not a convict, nor yet was he being taken to prison. On the contrary, he looked a very honest and respectable man. He wore a top silk hat and a tail coat. Nevertheless, he had on that strong chain, and the chain was round his waist.

Now to what was this man chained? He was chained neither to warder, nor to keeper, nor yet to the seat of the railway carriage. The fact is, this man was not chained to anything, but something was chained to him. That something was a black bag. Perhaps the bag was full of money, for he got into the train near the Bank of England. Now you have all heard of bag-snatchers. Well, this man evidently did not mean his bag to be snatched. If any one had tried to snatch his bag he would have had to snatch him also, and as he was a big man that would not have been easy. That man had his bag chained to himself.

Now there are many people who are very like that man. They are chained, or at least something is chained to them, though, unlike the man in the train, their chains are of a kind which cannot be seen. Still, they are chained right enough. Some people have money chained to them, and they are chained to money, not because it is their duty to keep safe other people's money, as it was with the man in the train, but because they are always thinking and worrying about money, either about the money they have got, or about the money they have not got, but wish they had got. So they become slaves to money; their whole lives are in bondage to money.

Then there is a Psalm which says of certain people, 'Pride compasseth them about as a chain.'

Now it is an awful thing to have pride chained on to you in that way; it prevents your doing many things which you ought to do, so that you often hear people say, 'I know I ought to do that, but my pride will not let me.' And in the same way, there are others who have bad habits chained on to them. They will say, 'I wish I didn't do this or that, but I can't break myself of the habit.' And still others seem always to be chained to their own worst selves, so that like Paul of old they have to say, 'The good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do.' So there are many lives which are fettered and crippled.

But there is One who can break every chain of this kind, and can set us free with a glorious liberty. That One is our Lord Jesus Christ. It is true that the first thing which Jesus seeks to do to every life which would know freedom is to bind something else to that life. That Something Else is nothing less than His own self. But he to whose life Christ is bound is set free from every bond which would hold him to base and unworthy things; he can say, 'O Lord, thou hast loosed my bonds.'

Nearly.

BY THE REVEREND T. W. BEVAN, BRADFORD.

'I press toward the mark.'—Ph 3¹⁴.

I came across a proverb the other day. It was this. 'Nearly is not even half-way.' I wonder if it is true. I thought about it and thought about it until—well, something came into my mind about you and about older people.

I remembered one summer's day when, walking in the fields, I observed a boy, red-cheeked and excited, chasing after a butterfly—a Monarch I think it was. He ran here and ran there in quick pursuit as the butterfly darted and rose in its flight. For almost a quarter of an hour he kept up the chase and, finally, as the butterfly approached the high hawthorns on the field's boundary line, he made a desperate attempt to catch it in the cap which he held high in his hand. He was just too low. Another half-inch and the butterfly would have been caught in the cap as the boy brought down his arm in a sweeping movement. I saw the Monarch, now fluttering and turning, ascend and pass over the hawthorns and pass out of view. Crestfallen and tired, the boy returned to the path which ran by the opposite side of the field. In a few moments I knew he must pass me. As he

came near I shouted cheerily, 'You didn't catch him, then?' 'No,' he replied, 'but I nearly had him.' Nearly! Well, in his case nearly wasn't half-way, was it?

Then again, I saw a man, only a few weeks ago, rushing for his train at a northern railway station. He arrived panting and blowing and mumbling something about the last train to London. The train was just passing out of the station. 'Sorry,' said the porter, offering his sympathy to the breathless man, 'the train has just started out.' 'Ugh!' returned the man disappointedly, 'I have missed it after all.' Now that man nearly caught the train, didn't he? But, you will agree, in his case as well as in the case of the boy who chased the butterfly, nearly was not even half-way.

Of course, boys and girls, you know that *nearly* to win a prize, or *nearly* to pass an examination, means a failure to achieve it.

There was once a Governor of a Roman Province called Festus who, with others, had to judge of the doings of that great missionary, St. Paul; for the Jews had laid complaints against him. Paul, in giving evidence, like all brave men, kept nothing back. He told the whole truth of what he was doing for the Lord Jesus Christ and explained how he had been converted on the Damascus Road. Well, Festus had with him King Agrippa, Bernice, and other important people, who became so interested that, though they were Romans, they almost forgot they were examining a prisoner. And King Agrippa, evidently forgetting the seriousness of the case he had to judge, cried out to Paul, 'Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian.' Almost! That meant he had been nearly persuaded to become a Christian. Paul, growing bolder, cried out, 'I would to God, that not only thou, but also all that hear me this day, were both almost, and altogether such as I am, except these bonds.' Now 'nearly' in the case of King Agrippa suggests more than half-way, doesn't it? And yet it wasn't, really. King Agrippa was still less than half-way towards the Christian life.

Of course, it was something attempted when the boy tried to catch the butterfly, and again when the man tried to catch the train. And it was something when King Agrippa was caught up in the enthusiasm of Paul's speech. But it was just nearly—almost. Not one of them achieved the object. They did not even gain half of it. The fact is, children, 'nearly' and 'almost' mean defeat.

So I think the proverb is true. And I am never again going to be content with saying, 'I nearly

succeeded, I almost won.' I am going to try to be like St. Paul. He once said, 'I count myself not yet to have apprehended, but I press on towards the mark of the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.' There was no 'nearly' for him. It was a case not of 'almost' but 'altogether.' That is what I am going to do, aren't you?

The Christian Year.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

The Helpful Trend of Modern Science towards Religion. III.

BY THE REVEREND P. N. BUSHILL, B.A.,
ORPINGTON.

'Whom do men say that I the Son of man am?'—Mt 16¹³.

We do not, of course, go to science for an opinion about Jesus Christ: religion is really out of its province. Nor do we need to. Our faith is founded upon the conviction of our own hearts, and we need no support from other persons' opinions. But there are people who feel the difficulties of the modern situation: who doubt, for instance—to mention only one difficulty—whether in a world of constant evolution the 'perfect' in any form can yet have been reached. But is not modern thought much more helpful to a belief in Jesus Christ than is commonly supposed? There may still be barriers to the humble acceptance of Jesus Christ as the Son of God, and the Saviour of men, but such barriers are not erected by scientists and philosophers of the present day. Jesus Christ is seen to satisfy the essential conditions which provide the Ultimate Truth of science and thought and life to-day.

1. *Jesus Christ is the Ultimate Truth of Science.*—Science has discovered that there is a meaning to Nature, a purpose; though science has not, and cannot, give us the name. Science to-day does not only admit, but even contends, that there is a purpose in existence, in the universe. Now a dominant purpose implies a personal purpose: an impersonal purpose is really a contradiction in terms. S. B. John in a practical book, *The Finality of Christ*, to which I desire to acknowledge indebtedness, says, after careful inquiry (p. 84): 'the peculiar concepts of religion can not only live in the present view of Nature, but are its very *raison d'être*' . . . 'To be irreligious is to be fundamentally irrational.'

But what about the religion of Jesus Christ, which is our inquiry to-day? Whom do men say that I the Son of man am? We have been brought up on the slogans, 'struggle for existence,' 'survival

of the fittest,' and these still stand for great truths; but to-day we are beginning to realize that the 'fittest' are not always the 'strongest,' and that co-existent with the struggle for existence there is also a 'struggle for others.' With competition there is also altruism in Nature: and as a matter of scientific fact the Biblical truth so well illustrated in the life of Christ that it is the 'meek' who 'inherit the earth' is being realized as true. Professor Thomson (quoted by S. B. John, p. 86) has said: 'the older view of the competitive struggle had too much red in it, and it is possible to interpret the ideals of ethical progress through love and sociality, co-operation, and sacrifice . . . as the highest expressions of the central evolutionary processes of the natural world.' Professor Whitehead, in *Science and the Modern World*, has said: 'In the history of the world, the prize has not gone to those species which specialized in methods of violence, or even in defensive armour. In fact, Nature began with producing animals encased in hard shells for defence against the ills of life. It also experimented in size. But smaller animals, without external armour, warm-blooded, sensitive, and alert, have cleared these monsters off the earth.' Wolves have gone, dogs are here. It is all in harmony with the teaching of our Lord, 'The meek shall inherit the earth.' Science to-day is substantiating the principles of that teaching.

And science to-day is supporting the New Testament story of the Life of Christ. Sir Oliver Lodge in an address to the Westbourne Park Fellowship said: 'The progress of science is tending towards the strengthening of theology in all its vital aspects. Certain occurrences, of which the Bible tells us, have been doubted. I cite as examples the direct voice at the Baptism, the Presence at the Transfiguration, and Saul's vision on the road to Damascus. All these things science is beginning to show were true happenings.' Of course, we got there by the short cut and safe route of faith, but the slower steps of the scientists are now coming there also. Jesus Christ is the Ultimate Truth of science.

2. *Jesus Christ is the Reality of Philosophy's Ideal.*—Right from the days of Greek philosophy before Christ men were inquiring the 'why' and 'wherefore' of the world: what is the ultimate reality? And they found the answer invariably to be in mind or intelligence. And since mind is personal, the Supreme Reality must be personal. The Beautiful, the Good, the True, as ideals in themselves, are not sufficient: you may have a beautiful face with a very cruel heart, and who is enamoured of that? But in Christ you have the

Beautiful, the Good, and the True all personified. And the world is still more beautiful to one who knows Christ: 'Heaven above is softer blue. . .'

Then there is the concept of value which philosophy and religion alike stress. There is the high imperative, the ideal, the 'ought' of human life. And everything must be sacrificed in the fulfilment of this 'ought.' Dr. Cairns in his book, *The Reasonableness of the Christian Faith*, p. 66, tells the story of a brilliant student who lost his life in saving a youth who, despite warnings, was in danger of drowning: a deliberate case of self-sacrifice. Reason was against it, for the more useful man was drowned; and yet our conscience compels us to admit that the young man did right: he did the only thing he could do. There is a philosophic value in that action. And where do you get that sacrifice illustrated to the full as in the self-expressing, self-giving, self-sacrificing life and death of Jesus Christ?

Yes, despite other theories, other philosophies, Christ's ideal of goodness holds the field to-day: it dominates all our laws, and it inspires all our ethics. John Stuart Mill (S. B. John, p. 94) has said that it would not be easy even for an unbeliever to find a better translation of the rule of virtue than to endeavour so to live that Christ would approve his life. Not even the War has discredited the ideal of Jesus Christ: Mr. Bernard Shaw has said that 'the only person who has come out of the war with any intellectual credit is Jesus Christ.' And Professor E. F. Scott has said: 'To-day, as never before, Jesus stands out as the moral leader of humanity. The principles which He laid down have been vindicated through the bitter experiences of the last few years, and men of all opinions are now agreed that the society of the future can be securely built on no other foundation.' Jesus Christ is the Reality, the fulfilment of all that philosophy has been seeking.

3. *Jesus Christ is the Answer to Psychology's Requirements.*—Modern psychology teaches us that all action is the direct or indirect outcome of instincts. We have many instincts, some of them very diverse, very different. Wrong-doing is a misuse of these instincts. Every instinct in itself is good; but it needs the right channel for expression. We have discordant desires pulling different ways: these need co-ordination. It is impossible to kill an instinct: it is difficult and even dangerous to repress an instinct. They need control. Now occasionally in ways other than religious this channel is provided: for instance, in times of national crisis, from patriotic motives, all

selfish and self-indulgent instincts may be converted to one aim and object. Even a strong affection for a person may have the same effect. The psychologist admits that it is very helpful, if not essential, that the person should have help from a power outside of himself. Now where better can the psychologist's requirements be met than in Jesus Christ? Conversion is not only a spiritual experience, but a psychological necessity. All the instincts must be centred round one supreme purpose. E. S. Waterhouse, in *Psychology and Religion*, p. 96, says: 'If a life is spiritually out of proportion, if things have got misplaced, if life has no dominant purpose . . . religious exercises are useless. . . . What is needed is conversion, which means not any particular form of emotional crisis or decision, but a re-centring of life, and a revaluation of all its values.' Only Christ can satisfy our instincts, giving them a right channel through which they may be expressed in action. Emotional instincts can find their satisfaction in the family of the Church; fighting instincts can find their expression in working for the Kingdom of God; and the highest instincts of all can find their true fulfilment in self-sacrifice, in treading the path which our Lord Himself trod to the Cross. What men and women need for right action is not more moral teaching, more good examples, but their whole life centring round the great and beautiful life of Jesus Christ, with all our affection dominated by love to Him: . . . in other words, conversion to Jesus Christ.

And so, can we sum up? 'Whom do men say that I, the Son of man, am?' Is not Jesus Christ in the world of thought to-day the answer to the riddle of the universe, the answer to the needs of men, the one fact that gives reason and understanding and purpose to this world and to human life? You take a chess problem: a few pieces on the board, a problem to solve; for some time it seems a muddle, you cannot see the purpose of some pieces at all; you try one suggestion and then another, and in some vital way they fail. Then at last it comes: you have it! You have found the *key* to the problem: it all fits in: not one piece is on the board without a purpose: it is all as clear as daylight, and you wonder why you did not think of it before. So is the world. So is life. So are you and I. Wonderful, enigmatic, past understanding, trivial, marvellous! What does it all mean? Then bring in the Person of Jesus of Nazareth. It is all clear! Here is the Power for living, and the Purpose for life. Here is the Ultimate Truth of all science and philosophy. Here is the Key to the riddle of life.

'Whom do men say that I, the Son of man, am?' We can answer with Peter, feeling that we have with us the weight of all true science and thought: 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.'

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

The Vision of the Invisible.

'And Elisha prayed, and said, Lord, I pray thee, open his eyes, that he may see. And the Lord opened the eyes of the young man; and he saw: and, behold, the mountain was full of horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha.'—2 K 6¹⁷.

An individual may be fighting a battle for truth and righteousness against great odds. The world says he is engaged in a hopeless contest and is bound to be broken. What chance had Luther at the Diet of Worms when he flung down his challenge both to the Church and the world? Most men would have said, 'He will have no chance. His enemies will ride him down and crush him with their iron hoofs.' Yes, but they would have forgotten the most important factor of all—the chariots of fire round about Luther.

If, as we look on the world, it seems to us that evil is mightier than good, let us look again and again and again, until we see the mountain full of horses and chariots of fire round about the righteous.

1. *The Vision of the Invisible*.—We are inclined to think that Elisha is the central figure in this story. The young man seems to us to be simply a necessary piece of stage machinery. But we have as much to learn from the young man as from the prophet. This must have been a great day in his life. It was for him the beginning of days, the day on which the scales fell from his eyes and he beheld the invisible. Henceforth the world could never appear the same to him.

What is the meaning of this wonderful experience that came to him? 'And the Lord opened the eyes of the young man, and he saw.' His experience was a supernatural experience.

There is an illumination of the soul which cannot be won by mere travail of intellect, though that also has its place in the spiritual life. There is an insight into the dark riddles of the universe which is gained not by laborious scientific investigation but by the awakening touch of the living Spirit of God. Though we may fail to define satisfactorily revelation, and inspiration, they are undeniable facts of human experience. The Divine Spirit touches our eyes and we *see*. The way of prayer is the way of vision. It is not a private bypath, but the King's Highway, open to every pilgrim.

It makes all the difference to our interpretation of life whether we have this vision of the invisible.

It will affect our interpretation of the events of life. In the Book of the Acts we have the story of the martyrdom of Stephen. A Jew of that day, having heard of the tumult, might have said to a spectator, 'What happened?' 'Oh,' he would have said, 'it was rather a squalid scene. A fanatical young Nazarene was brought before the Council. He made a most insolent speech to his judges, and, very naturally, he was cast out of the city and stoned to death.' 'Was that all?' 'Yes, that was all.' But was it all? It was all that the spectator saw; but Stephen saw more. He 'looked up stedfastly to heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God.' The whole scene is transfigured by the vision of the invisible. It is no longer squalid, but is radiant with a glory Divine. The victim becomes a conqueror, and his judges are judged.

It will affect our sense of values. Two men stand beneath Niagara for the first time, and as they gaze at the majestic sweep of the waters, A. says to B., 'What are you thinking of?' 'Dollars,' is the answer. 'If only I could harness all this power that is running to waste, and use it to generate electricity which should light cities, move trains, and carry messages from city to city and from land to land, I should be a millionaire.' 'What are you thinking of?' says B. to A. 'God,' is the answer in a hushed voice. A solemn awe has descended upon his soul, his eyes have pierced the veil, and his ears catch the messages of Him whose voice is as the sound of many waters. And the one goes away to light his little bulbs in the habitations of men, and to transmit from town to town the words of a day or of a year. But the other goes forth to kindle in men's hearts the light of faith, and to pass from mouth to mouth the words by which men live.

2. *The Courage begotten by the Vision of the Invisible.*—We are surrounded by innumerable enemies who threaten our peace of mind, the integrity of our character, the happiness of our homes, and the progress of the race. We know the names of these foes—temptation, passion, adversity, disease, sorrow, bereavement, death. At any moment one or more of them may swoop down upon us and shatter the frail edifice of our peace or happiness. Is it any wonder that there is fear in our hearts? None at all. Is it possible that the fear may be cast out so that we can face life with a buoyant, hopeful courage? Yes, that is what happens when we see the heavens opened

and behold the invisible. Shut a prisoner up in a dark cell into which there penetrates no ray of light, and he will give way to despair. But let there be but a narrow slit in the wall through which a sunbeam may enter his cell by day and through which he can see even a single star by night, and he will preserve his sanity and courage and hope against the day of his deliverance. And mid the darkness of the world, we can only keep our courage and hope and, in the truest sense, our sanity in so far as we see the light and radiance of the other world.

You will remember that the Psalmist says, 'The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God.' He adds the highly significant words, 'There were they in great fear where no fear was.'

It is written of Moses that 'he endured as seeing him who is invisible,' or, as Dr. Moffatt translates it, 'Like one who saw the King invisible, he never flinched.' And if we will read the story of those who have led humanity on with dauntless courage and unwavering faith and quenchless hope, we shall find that they all merit the same epitaph—'They saw the King invisible, and never flinched.' Walking in the light of the vision they cried to their comrades, 'Fear not,' and themselves were unafraid.

3. *The Invincibility of those who dwell in the Vision of the Invisible.*—'They that be with us are more than they that be with them.' Because the children of the unseen can say this, however hard pressed they may be, they are always invincible.

It has been said that Providence is always on the side of the big battalions. The saying is true, but not in the sense in which it was spoken. The big battalions are invisible.

What are these unseen forces? What are the invisible battalions that fight for the man who has gained his franchise in the unseen world? They are the primal forces of the universe—love and righteousness, and truth, unnumbered companies of angels, the spirits of just men made perfect, Jesus the Mediator of a new Covenant, and the mighty all-conquering Spirit of the living God. These are the invisible allies of the children of the Spirit. Who can withstand them? They are invincible, and we through them are more than conquerors.

These days are full of difficulty and perplexity for those who love righteousness and hate iniquity. The forces of righteousness are hard pressed, our individual faith is sorely tried, and we are tempted to give way to panic and to fear. Let us pray that

our eyes may be opened that we may see the invisible battalions. Let us send out a cry for reinforcements, and we shall find that unseen horsemen are fighting by our side, and that chariots of fire encircle us.¹

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

Faith in God.

'God, who . . . hath . . . spoken.'—He 1¹.²

'God, who hath spoken'—so, positively and grandly, a Biblical writer begins. Would that today we could put the emphasis where he put it—not on *talking* about God, but on *hearing* God's own speech! The Psalmist called a man a fool who said in his heart, 'There is no God.' But some people thought St. Paul was a fool because he said there *was* a God, and became eloquent in his belief. This introduces us to an aspect of our subject which we had better recognize frankly, and at the outset. The reality of God can never be made plain-sailing. Belief may therefore have to consent to carry within it to the end the quality of oddity. From certain points of view the saints have been absurd people—yet therein lay their creative consequence for history.

We have to face this, then, that there is no simple and easy way out in the high realm of religion. We might remember this, to our profit, when we are in the library pursuing the 'proofs' of God's existence, or wondering what next thing science has to say upon God as it leans back from its uncertain commerce with the atom or electron. It would seem as if religious experience were a kind of collision, sometimes a violent collision. We know God, so to speak, only when God pleases to hit us! This is what the prophets stammer out at us in their great hours. And when we are in conference and debate over God we must consider this unique character of the field we are in.

1. *Faith is so difficult*, in certain moods which visit us, that its continuity in the lives of people should suggest to us that some overwhelming spiritual forces must have entered into their holding of it. And it is the case that this faith has insisted on continuing; it has survival doggedness. There is an interesting criterion applied by New Testament scholars to the study of the original text. They tell us that where there are several manuscript readings of the same Greek text, it is a fairly safe rule that the difficult reading is the correct, the original one. It is possible that a principle of that kind is applicable to more than the study of words,

it may be a clue in dealing with the philosophies of life. He would be a poor creature in any case who dealt impatiently with religion because it intensified at first all the problems for him. Even in such a trim and neat field as that of mathematics simple formulæ are not so fashionable as once they were. Perhaps we should go right out for the affirmation that *only* a difficult conception of the meaning of the world is likely to do justice to its manifold of facts and events. Plainly the earth is flat, and is at rest. But not so after all. The actuality is a round earth whirling through space! Faith is the difficult reading, but that may be part of the case and strength of faith.

2. A difficult faith—and yet *how thrilling this faith is!* It is not the first thing, or the early thing, any of us would conceive, that at the root and heart of things there is a Force, a Purpose, a life that acts and desires as Jesus Christ acted and desired. Yet in the high regions of life truth has not seldom an astonishing, a dramatic quality. It is just here that some recent 'findings' of thought appear to us somewhat shallow. We are told that God is simply the symbol of all that we are striving after in our best moments, or that God is the next thing that is to be because we are striving. With all due respect to the desire of such thinking to enhance the significance of the historical order and of personality, is it not in the end prosaic, insipid? The world of faith is also a world where man has a great place, but not the first place. There are occasions, some one has said, when a shudder is a true argument. So also we might say to be thrilled is evidence.

3. Nor is this difficult and thrilling faith without *its intellectual reasonableness*. Here, for example, is the order of Nature—a strange order it may seem to us, and yet it is steeped in rationality; it suggests mind, and the same mind throughout. We say that Nature is hard upon life—yet how queer and gracious that order can be. It has songs in it, it has giving and sharing, it reaches by way of one creature's burden to the larger life for many. We tend to think of Nature in terms of its wild things, but we must take in its 'live, willed things' also, and judge the whole, so far as we may, in the line of its dominant suggestiveness. And in this regard it may be that a bird's nest is more significant for the argument than its size would at first sight indicate. Law and order and intelligent purpose are here. All these, yes, and even more. For there are linkages, fitnesses, mutualities which suggest a peculiar richness in the ground and source of Nature and life. What is the meaning of this

¹ H. M. Hughes, *Faith and Progress*, 67.

'plus' and 'extra'? Can it be that here, again, the difficult reading is the significant one? Faith with its creed of a Redeemer God can go forth to Nature and find marks of His redemptive activity there. Faith does justice to the greatest number of Nature's facts and that on a higher level.

And, again, there is history in its vast tracts and incidents. It is surely strange that, despite all the horrid things done to and by men, despite all our treacheries and rebellions, the order of life has continued, has been maintained. What is this behind the human story, which does not break it forthwith when it spoils itself, which lingers ere it comes to judge, which seems reluctant to let a nation fall even when it is very evil, and which often works a resurrection? Does it not look as if the quality of patience, of hope, of long-suffering were here in operation? And if the Power behind existence is as faith declares that Power to be, would not the activity of that Power have as one of its forms just that which the long course of our history suggests and incarnates? To the Force that is responsible for our being in life at all, human life must have a value. Indeed, our 'values' are derivative from that original one.

The supreme fact of Nature and of history is moral personality. Faith in God is necessary to interpret the rise and ministry in the world of great moral spirits. If religion is an illusion, the illusion has afflicted most severely those who by all counts were least likely to be so affected. The great personalities of history have been strong in the sense of dependence; always in their hearts an awareness of a Reality, a Life Source whence their strength came, whence came to them 'in moments of clear weather' intimations, disclosures, encouragements. Is it not more likely that we poor critics of these great souls are suffering from illusion in criticism than that they suffered from illusion when they spoke of God, the Living One, accessible to men?

4. For us in the end, as we discuss the grounds of religious faith, discerning paradox in religion and paradox in life, we shall find the issue narrowing down, or rather culminating in the question how we are to classify and estimate Jesus Christ. Beyond all question supremacy belonged to Him. We find nothing in the story of the Gospels to suggest that while we may consent to His ethical authority, His theological authority is not similarly constraining. The fact would seem to be that it was of God Christ made men sure before He made them wise and quick in duty. This is how He has continued to tell in history. Here still is the crucial stance for

our minds, and here the issue is to be decided not in terms of logic alone, but in terms of the insights and loyalties of our total personality.

Thou hast been faithful to my highest need

Yet most I thank Thee, not for any deed,
But for the sense Thy living self doth breed
That Fatherhood is at the world's great core.¹

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

From Magic to Religion: David sends back the Ark and leaves the issue with God.

BY THE REVEREND JOHN LENDRUM, D.D., ELGIN.

'And lo Zadok also, and all the Levites were with him, bearing the ark of the covenant of God: and they set down the ark of God; and Abiathar went up, until all the people had done passing out of the city. And the king said unto Zadok, Carry back the ark of God into the city: if I shall find favour in the eyes of the Lord, he will bring me again, and shew me both it, and his habitation: But if he thus say, I have no delight in thee; behold, here am I, let him do to me as seemeth good unto him.'—2 S 15^{24, 26}.

As the test of courage is danger, so that of faith is adversity; and one of the marks of greatness in David, King of Israel, is that in the hour of crisis he always responded most nobly. His favourite son, the Absalom he loved and spoiled, had conspired against him, and, proclaiming himself king, had won so much favour and gathered so large a following that David felt his position in Jerusalem to be insecure and sought safety in flight, hoping also thereby to avoid fighting and bloodshed. He left the City with his ministers and officers of state, and, halting at the Far House—the last house on the eastern face of the ridge of Zion—he allowed his bodyguard and such other armed men as held to him to pass on before him, the route lying across the brook Kidron, up the face of the Mount of Olives, towards the Jordan and the wilderness.

For a king who had many a time led his army to victory, extended and consolidated his kingdom, and, to all seeming, firmly established his throne, it must have been a bitter and heart-breaking experience to have to flee from his capital because of the impatient ambition and heartless rebellion of a beloved son. All the people, we read, 'wept with a loud voice,' as the fugitives passed out, and as David and his men climbed Mount Olivet, they were 'weeping as they went up,' with covered heads and barefoot. It was a sore hour for David

¹ J. Macleod, in *A Faith for To-day*, 17.

—this hour of hurried and ignominious flight. How did he meet it?

With him at the halting-place above the Kidron ravine, among the other officers of his court, were the two chief priests, Zadok and Abiathar; and they had with them the Ark of God. That the Ark should accompany the king and his troops when they left the City had been taken by its custodians as a matter of course; and there they were, according to custom and without orders, bearing the Ark and halting and setting it down when the king halted. For to Israel in those days the Ark was their most sacred and precious possession; and as its presence was believed to be the presence of God Himself and the pledge of victory, it used in time of war to be carried out upon the field of battle. Once indeed, on that dark day in the time of Eli, the Ark had not merely failed to bring victory but had been captured by the Philistines. And it had been kept by them for a while. But David at length had found it and brought it to Jerusalem with much ceremony and great rejoicing, he himself dancing before it in his joy. The Ark, then, was a thing peculiarly dear to David, and to have it with him in the day of adversity and peril would have been a comfort to him and also, as he with others doubtless believed, a succour and a defence. Its presence, too, would have steadied and inspired his followers. Yet, to their surprise and ours, David ordered the priests to take it back, 'Carry back the ark of God into the city.'

Why did he do this? It was not that he feared for the Ark, lest again it should be taken, sending it back so as to be safe within the walls of Jerusalem; he was not marching towards the land of the Philistines or against any foreign foe. It was not for the Ark he was afraid; it was for Absalom. Selfish and disloyal as Absalom had shown himself, David loved him still, thinking of him as foolish rather than bad; and, just as at a later point when fighting was inevitable, he charged his captains to deal gently for his sake with the young man, so at the beginning of the trouble he shrank from the thought of taking up arms against his son, lest in the fighting he might get wounded or even killed, and shrank above all from what the taking of the Ark with him would have meant—an invoking and even a constraining of the Divine presence and power to work for himself and against his son. To take the Ark with him was, as it were, to pray for Absalom's defeat, and even to make it certain—his defeat, and perhaps even his death. David could not do it; he would not do it. Even in what must have been one of the bitterest hours

in his experience, when throne and kingdom and life were in grave peril, and he might well have grasped at any and every chance of succour, David was ready to forgo the protection the Ark of God's presence would have brought to himself rather than have it work and tell against his son. With splendid generosity, with noble unselfishness, he ordered the Ark to be carried back into the city.

And by so doing he did far more than he knew. For, taken back that day, the Ark never again left Jerusalem. From that day the Ark had rest. Never again was it carried forth to war. By that brief order of his, 'Carry back the ark of God into the city,' he broke through a custom and struck the first blow at a superstition.

In a critical hour, when he was in dire need, David sent back the Ark. He refused to use the Ark—that is, to bring in the presence and power of God—because to use it thus for himself was to use it, and to set the Divine power a-working, against his son. To send back the Ark was, he felt, the right, the unselfish thing to do. And even as he did it, light broke upon him, and he had sight of a great spiritual principle, a principle which leads away from magic which seeks to coerce God, towards true and pure religion which never forgets to worship and adore. To use the Ark as men aforetime had used it was to make use of God; it was to compel Him to do the will of man. And that, in a flash of spiritual insight, David saw, could never be right.

It was not humble, it was not reverent. It was mortal, sinful man daring and presuming to set himself above God, trying to make God a servant and a tool. No, said David to himself and to Zadok, he would not dictate to God, would not try to impose his will upon God; he would leave God Himself to decide what the issue was to be. If it pleased God to restore him to his throne and city, so that he should look on the Ark once more and God's dwelling-place, that would be well—very well. But, on the other hand, were it God's will that he should be a wanderer and Absalom reign in his stead, that also would be well. It was not for him to force the hand of God; he would leave himself entirely in His hands. 'Behold, here am I, let him do to me as seemeth good unto him.'

Whatever his faults may have been, David had the root of the matter in him. He could sin, but also he could repent. He had the fear of God in him, the spirit of reverence and a great humility. His religion had in it the essential element of

adoration. Hence, even in the day of adversity, he does not tell God what He has to do, does not plead his own deserts, does not clamour for his own way. Instead of seeking to impose his will on God, he is ready to wait until God shows what His will is. And thereby David teaches us how to pray. In asking what we know to be in accordance with God's will—growth in goodness, for instance, or the spread of the gospel—we may ask it boldly, and the intensity and importunity of our prayer will tell for and hasten its fulfilment. But when an issue still hangs in the balance—the recovery or life of a friend, the success or failure of an enterprise—while we cannot but pray for what our hearts desire, we may not demand it; we may not forget, we should humbly face the possibility, that the other thing may prove to be what God wills. In the presence of God we who are but men, ignorant, foolish, and sinful, may never cease to be reverent and humble, bending our heads in worship, submitting ourselves to His will, leaving all with Him.

Strangely enough, not far from the place where David, sending back the Ark, left himself in the hands of God, there was in later days the Garden of Gethsemane, where our Lord, in a far darker hour, yet with even more perfect faith, prayed the prayer which must ever be our supreme pattern and exemplar:

- 'O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt.'
 'O my Father, if this cup may not pass from me, except I drink it, thy will be done.'

That the cup might pass from Him, that He might be spared the drinking of it—such was His desire, natural and human. But He did not demand it, clamour for it, press for it. He left Himself wholly in the hands of God. If He had to drink the bitter cup, He would drink it, not resigning Himself to it as to an evil fate, but accepting it as His Father's will, wise and good. And it was there in the Garden, before Calvary, and in the secret place of the spirit, that the real sacrifice was made—the sacrifice of the will. There the Son of David, the Son of God, 'offered Himself without spot to God.'

SEPTUAGESIMA.

An Examination of Christ's Generation.

'He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he

power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name.'—Jn 1¹¹. 12.

What did Christ's generation think of Him? Many of us are inclined to argue that it does not matter at this time of day what His generation thought of Jesus: for they have been convicted by all other generations, of the world's greatest historic misjudgment. They saw Him, but did not see His majesty. They heard His voice, but missed His eternal message. They actually had this wonderful Lord in their midst, and they nailed Him to a cross!

At first sight, it may seem needless or worthless to ask what Christ's age thought of Him. No doubt this is true so far as any justice to Jesus Himself is concerned: for the world has finally given Him its adoration. But the inquiry may be necessary in justice not so much to Him as to His maligned generation.

1. It is true to say—that lonely Cross is the final proof—that Jesus was rejected by His own generation. It is a pity, however, that those who quote this judgment as a general condemnation of Christ's generation do not stay to finish the quotation. For the Evangelist purposely added another clause, 'But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name.' It is a joy to know that countless numbers did receive Him, and believed on His name. Indeed, it is by their passion, sacrifice, and loyalty that the world and the Church are what they are to-day. With the exception of that last week in Jerusalem, Christ's work was pursued with wonderful friendliness and receptiveness. What happiness He had, what attentive crowds, what loyal friendships, what adoring followers! We think so much of the black enmity of the priests of Jerusalem, who hated Him because He seemed to assail their religious system and invade their privileges, that we forget the countless homes throughout the land where He was welcomed, and the serenities of love that made Him glad.

Further, let us remember that all the workers and eager servants who afterwards turned the world upside down were 'his own.' We forget that He founded a bigger 'school' of workers in His lifetime than any other teacher in the world. It is so easy to overlook the fact that during the whole Galilee mission, which comprised the greater part of His earthly ministry, there were bands of approved followers, seventy at one time, preaching His message and doing His work of grace.

Still further, 'his own' were the great means for that astounding propagation of the gospel all over

the known world that is still our modern amazement. In one century these people did more, under greater difficulties, than all the other centuries have done together. And this is the great fact—that *wherever 'his own' went, they went first to 'his own.'* We forget this in the light of later hostility and persecution. What a welcome they received among the scattered Jews of the world! We know that in certain cities St. Paul was opposed and persecuted by the Jews—but again only by the ruling class. There can be no possible doubt that from the Jewish people came the first, the most passionate, and the finest Christians! 'He came unto his own, and his own received him gladly.'

It was the ruling class—the Priests, the Sadducees, and the Pharisees—who plotted Christ's death and procured His crucifixion. Some of the Jerusalem mob (they could not be numerous in that narrow street outside the Prætorium; and many even of these were strangers from all quarters at the Passover), called aloud in prejudice for Christ's death, primed by the priests in their midst. But to say that the *people of Jerusalem* put Jesus to death is quite untrue. It may be admitted, perhaps, that a section of the priests, as God's official representatives, was, or should have been, in a special sense, 'his own.' In that sense, and only in that sense, 'he came unto his own, and his own received him not.'

2. The common people of His own day passed some wonderful judgments on Him, which have never been bettered in any age. In the first place, we are pointedly told that they were astonished at His *authority*.

His own generation saw clearly that He did not need to grope His way to moral truth, waveringly and fumblingly, as their own Scribes did. He spoke about God and God's will as a personal revelation: *He knew God*. To them, His message was like light: we never need to prove light, we know it. It was like power: we cannot define power, we feel it. It was like truth: there is something instinctive in us that rises up and greets truth as self-evident.

3. Christ's generation, in its puzzled way, recorded a second judgment equally honourable to itself and Jesus. We read that they discerned one quality of our Lord and His work which they and we, for lack of a better term, might call His *uniqueness or originality*.

St. Mark tells us in his opening chapter that when the gathered crowds heard Jesus speak of His Kingdom and of God, they cried out in amazement, 'What new doctrine is this?' The emphasis

in that remark is quite obviously on the word *new*. Again, in chap. 6 the same Evangelist notes that the people exclaimed, 'From whence hath this man these things? And what wisdom is this that is given unto him?' St. John remarks that the priests and Pharisees, the custodians of God's past messages, were dumbfounded at His words, and asked with amazement, 'Whence hath this man letters, having never learned?' This does not mean that they were astounded merely at His cleverness or His ability, or even at His inconvenient knowledge of the Bible. That, of course, is implied; for they wondered how He, who had never been at the recognized 'schools,' could possess this broad and exact knowledge of Scripture. But it implies also sheer amazement at His *interpretation and insight*, and also at the daring with which on occasion He actually supplemented the Old Testament, or even set it aside.

We meet critics in our own time who exult in showing just how much of Christ's teaching can be paralleled from other sources—something that Hosea or Plato or Seneca has said. They fail to see that, even if we could do this, it would not affect Christ's originality. It would, indeed, be a remarkable thing if we could not gather from other sources many parallels of things Jesus has said; for God has given all mankind the religious instinct and inspiration, and we have been dimly groping after moral and spiritual truth all through the centuries. In any case, Jesus did not profess to bring in something that was not there before, but only to perfect what we have been groping after since man was man. Even if one could parallel every saying of Jesus from other sources, would that affect His originality? We have lately discovered that Daniel Defoe, in writing *Robinson Crusoe*, used an obscure Dutch story which was written round the same theme and situation. But that does not affect any sensible person's notion of Defoe's originality; for he took what was dead and gave it life. In its motives and climax, *Macbeth* is taken from an old uninspired chronicle. Do we consider Shakespeare any less original because he gathered his dramatic material from earlier sources?

Even if it were true, which it is not, that one could parallel Christ's teaching from other sources, yet the judgment of His own generation would stand, that He was a new original source of truth from God. They saw what some of us fail to see—that His uniqueness lay not only in what He said, but in what He was! His life in all its moral perfection and in its absolute dependence on God was His greatest originality.

4. Our records have preserved another appreciation of Jesus by the men and women of His own day that should be observed by us with particular delight. St. Luke makes the following comment on the popular impression of Christ's ministry: 'And all bare him witness, and wondered at the words of grace which proceeded out of his mouth.' That phrase 'words of grace' does not mean only gracious, kindly words, contrasting, perhaps, with the harshness and dictatorial bluntness of the Scribes and Pharisees. That is suggested, no doubt. But far deeper than that, the people felt the essential *message of redeeming grace* that lay at the back of His words. What they noted was a question not only of the manner or 'manners' of the messenger, but of the content of His message. The old hard legalistic notions of God were wholly absent from His preaching. He spoke of God, first and last, as Father, as a God of love, mercy, tenderness, and pardon. It was not that He emphasized the laws of God's righteousness less than the Pharisees did. Indeed, He spoke of the justice and even the anger of a righteous God more than any legalist ever had done. But beyond this, about this, and mellowing this, was His message of the welcoming, forgiving, redeeming heart of God

the Father. That God could so immediately and so fully forgive a repentant sinner, as was shown in the Parable of the Father and the Prodigal Son, was a doctrine of grace that must have moved His age with a joyous astonishment we can never understand. And the puzzlement of the Elder Brother in the story is only a proof that the official legalism of the day could not grasp the full grace of the message.

None the less, His own age noted and hailed the grace of His message as 'good news.' The record says that the common people heard Him gladly. Not only were they pleased when He so brilliantly refuted the Pharisees and turned aside all their dialectic obstructions, but they took the big message of God's love to their own hearts. That people such as Matthew, the outcast publican, should be among His chosen Twelve, and that a man like Zacchæus or a woman like the Magdalene were among His ordinary friends, is sufficient proof that the sinners heard Him gladly and responded to His message of grace. There can be no doubt at all that the multitudes of His age received Him, welcomed Him, and followed Him. He came unto His own, *and His own received Him with passionate adoration.*¹

¹ J. Black, *An Apology for Rogues*, 159.

Man's Origin and Fall.

BY THE REVEREND J. H. MORRISON, M.A., ABERDEEN.

DR. EMIL BRUNNER declares that the doctrine of the Fall is of the first importance. For sin is not just a bias of the will, but an integral element in human nature as it now exists. Man is a sinner, he is affected by sin in the kernel of his personality. But Brunner, as is well known, is at war with the dominant thought of the age. Opposed to him are many Christian teachers who, under the influence of a doctrine of evolution, ignore or minimize or expressly repudiate the idea of a fall of man. Here is a vital issue. Is man a fallen being, or is he a heroic aspiring creature with the morning sun striking on his uplifted brow? Were they mistaken who spoke of him as strayed and lost and sinful, and must we now crown him with the proud title of *Homo Sapiens*? Should we hail his total achievement with a rousing 'Bravo!' and cheer him on his upward way, or should we preach the

gospel to him? In short, is he needing to be redeemed from his fallen state by the grace of God, or is he capable, given time, of being his own saviour?

The raising of this vital issue is due to the complete ascendancy which the doctrine of evolution has gained over the thought of our time. It has not only affected every department of knowledge, including ethics and religion, but it has brought about a new mental orientation which seems to render certain ways of thinking impossible and obsolete. It may not be inappropriate if we attempt some brief inquiry into the ascertained and established facts as distinct from theoretic speculations, and endeavour to find out how far these facts entitle us to go, what conclusions may legitimately be drawn from them, and what bearing they have on the Christian doctrine of man.

I. EVOLUTION.

Evolution is no novelty. The principle was firmly grasped by the ancient Greek philosophers who gave systematic expression to the consciousness which every thoughtful man has that we live in a world of change. But the all-important question of *how* the process of change was effected remained unanswered till Darwin came. He advanced an impressively simple explanation of the *modus operandi*. Limiting his investigations to the world of living creatures he reached the conclusion that they all have a power of varying indefinitely, and that these minute variations are weeded out under the pressure of the struggle for existence by a process of natural selection whereby the favourable are preserved and the unfavourable perish. In this way it became possible to imagine how in the immense lapse of the ages from one or at most a few primitive forms diverging from each other there has come to pass the endless complexity of the organic world. The publication of Darwin's work was a momentous event in the history of science. At one leap evolution, from being a philosophical speculation, became a practical working theory. It was received with enthusiasm by students of Nature who were being snowed under by ever fresh accumulations of unrelated facts. It provided them with a thread to guide them through the maze. Now at last they could see order emerging out of confusion; the very framework of Nature stood revealed.

Nothing could have surpassed the patience of Darwin in his investigations and his scrupulous regard for truth, and his work gave an impetus to research and led to an intellectual awakening for which the world must for ever be his debtor. But he cannot be held responsible for all that came after him, for not all of his followers have inherited his spirit. Many have been so carried away by the simplicity and beauty of the theory that they are unable to see the facts of Nature except through its medium. Yet John Stuart Mill warns us in his *Logic* that the assumption that Nature is simple is one of the greatest of fallacies. 'A large proportion of all the errors ever committed in the investigation of the laws of nature, have arisen from the assumption that the most familiar explanation or hypothesis must be the truest.'¹ Einstein's theory is not so simple as Newton's, which it has superseded, and it is too soon to rest in the belief that Darwin has spoken the final word. Many popularizers of the theory and many

preachers have been extremely incautious. 'I marvel,' said Lord Kelvin, 'at the undue haste with which teachers in our Universities and preachers in our pulpits are re-stating truth in the terms of evolution, while evolution itself remains an unproved hypothesis in the laboratories of science.' Heedless of this warning many have given free rein to their fancy and have drawn imaginary pictures of what the world must have been like, and how creatures must have acted in accordance with the accepted theory. It is not too much to say that the fanciful suggestions of the school of Paley in support of the doctrine of design have been more than equalled by the same sort of work in the schools of the evolutionists.

Much water, however, has flowed under the bridge since Darwin's day. Science has not stood still. In particular, most significant advances have been made in palæontology; embryology has become practically a new science; while the laws of Mendel have been discovered or rather resuscitated. Darwin himself, had he still been with us, would have been the most eager to welcome the new knowledge with open mind. He would never have dreamed of arguing, as some of his followers do, that the facts must fit his theory. Even a casual survey of the evidence as it is before us to-day will enable any person of ordinary intelligence to reach certain conclusions with some degree of confidence.

(a) Many facts of Nature do not seem to fit into the framework of Darwin's theory. Patient investigation will bring to light a surprising number. There is a regrettable tendency to emphasize and placard the favourable evidence and to leave in obscurity the facts which are intractable. Let one illustration suffice. Much prominence has been given to the Nuttall blood tests according to which, through the reaction set up by blood transfusion, different degrees of relationship are demonstrated between man and the lower creatures, particularly the apes. It may be remarked in passing that Nuttall's results are not all so unambiguous as is sometimes represented, one test indicating that the lemur (a species of monkey) was no nearer of kin to man than the crab, while in another test man was relegated to a class which included, besides the gorilla, the sheep and the civet cat! But passing over these as mere details which the popularizer may feel himself justified in ignoring, one cannot help remarking by contrast the remarkable absence of comment upon the difficulties which arise to the evolutionist from the irregularity in the chromosome numbers of different

¹ J. S. Mill, *System of Logic*, v. iii. 3.

species of germ cells. The germ cell, as is now known, is equipped with its definite number of chromosomes and genes which are the direct agents in transmitting life and determining specific characteristics. Now, if the number of these had been found to be arranged in orderly succession with the ape next to the human, it would undoubtedly have been hailed as the final proof of kinship, far more convincing than the chemical composition of the blood. But unfortunately there is no discernible order, some insects even having more than man. We look in vain for any evolutionist to give due emphasis to the fact that here at the vital centre, in Nature's most secret crucible, where life is generated and specific differences determined there is no discoverable trace of orderly evolution, but all is shrouded in impenetrable mystery.

Such facts steadily accumulate and are significant of the need of a more comprehensive theory which shall include and explain them. Scientists are finding it ever harder to put the new wine into the old bottles. It is an acknowledged fact that widely different species may develop new features and similar structural changes quite independently of one another. Sir Arthur Keith repeatedly explains such coincidences by the remark that the assumed common ancestor, though showing no sign or trace of that new feature, must have had a 'bias that way.' If Newton had explained the falling apple by the platitude that it must have had a bias that way, he would not have done much to advance the science of physics.

(b) There are scientists of weight who, in the light of all the facts, have found Darwin's theory inadequate. Passing over the great name of Virchow, who was from the first an opponent, one may mention De Vries, who argues that variations 'cannot even by the most rigid and sustained selection lead to a genuine overstepping of the limits of the species, and still less to the origin of new and constant characters.'¹ By his theory of Mutations, now generally accepted, according to which new species leap into being suddenly and without any known preparation, he has altered the whole basis of Darwinism. More recently Professor Leo Berg of Leningrad has published his monumental work on *Nomogenesis*. A Professor in Leningrad will not be suspected of theological bias, but point by point he counters the Darwinian theory with massive argument and wealth of biological evidence. His position is that living creatures have developed

from tens of thousands of primary forms, that the processes of change have often been convergent instead of divergent, that there have been no chance variations, but all have been governed by law, and that new species have arisen by leaps and have been sharply distinguished and have bred true from the first. Opinions will naturally differ as to the value of such theories, but to say, as is sometimes said, that all competent scientists are evolutionists is simply to stultify oneself, *if by evolution you mean Darwinism*.

(c) Even by those who still look to Darwin as the Master, his theory has been modified almost beyond recognition. Nothing would more conduce to clear thinking on this subject than a strict definition of the word 'evolution.' The term has been extended to cover everything. 'Evolution is orderly change,'² we are told, or 'Evolution is Nature's way,'³ in which case, of course, we are all evolutionists. But the characteristic features of the Darwinian theory, viz. chance variations, progress by minute increments, the natural selection of the lucky hit, all these have notably faded into the background. Sir J. Arthur Thomson declares that 'the naturalists of to-day are not so intellectually comfortable as their fathers were in declaring a result to be "the outcome of evolution."'⁴ Professor Bateson, in the Darwin Centenary Volume, wrote that 'no one can survey the work of recent years without perceiving that evolutionary orthodoxy developed too fast, and that a great deal has got to come down,' while later in his address as President of the British Association he caused no small stir by declaring that Darwin's theory, however admirable, was no longer authoritative. Professor Lloyd Morgan, whose theory of Emergent Evolution is in principle radically different from Darwin's, stresses the fact that 'in every field of inquiry we find abundant evidence of that which is the very opposite of evolution and is sometimes called "degeneration" or "devolution."'⁵

From all this it will appear that while scientists naturally cling to the governing idea of evolution, for without it scientific thought would again be adrift on 'blind night seas without a saving star,' yet with all that there is a growing consciousness that the problem is more complex than it was at first thought to be, and that the origin and relationships of species are wrapped in mystery. 'Per-

² Thomson and Geddes, *Evolution*, p. ix.

³ *Creation by Evolution*, 1.

⁴ *Concerning Evolution*, 97.

⁵ *Creation by Evolution*, 343.

¹ *The Mutation Theory*, i. 4.

haps the problem is beyond scientific solution,' says Sir J. Arthur Thomson. 'Perhaps the best answer is "*Ignoramus*."' ¹ So we find Professor Osborn making the interesting suggestion that 'as Einstein follows Newton, so some great philosopher of biology will follow Darwin.' ² What theory the Einstein of biology will propound it would be too impious and daring to suggest, however fascinating to imagine. Will he find the source of organic similarities in the ordering of a single mind rather than in biological descent from a single ancestor? Will his thought move along the line followed by Berg and others, leading to the conclusion that the world of living things is not to be conceived as a single tree but as a forest sprung from a multitude of seeds sown in the earth, and will he trace the human family tree back to one of these primitive seeds? Or, on the other hand, will he link together all living things in one organic whole, but noting the facts of devolution as well as those of progress, marking how at all stages of the advance creatures have turned aside into blind alleys whence further progress was impossible and man alone has gained the summit—noting all this, will he conclude that the mysterious thread of man's true ancestry was present from the first and provided the root stock of the great tree of creation? The future will declare. But in the meantime we do well to avoid the danger of anchoring fast to a rigid theory of evolution which is already half submerged by the rising tide of scientific thought.

II. THE HUMAN FAMILY TREE.

The fault of a dominant theory is that it becomes autocratic and impatient of criticism. The dominance of the Darwinian theory has imperiously demanded a certain line of ancestry for man. It requires that as we go backward, stage by stage, we should encounter lower and lower forms till man merges with the beasts. And so, instead of the quest of the Holy Grail, the knights of science are all out now on the search for the missing link. One would not object to this search if it were conducted with scrupulous fairness, but the mental bias which we have already noted is particularly obtrusive here. All that differentiates man from the apes is too lightly passed over, evidence favourable to the dominant theory is eagerly gathered and emphasized, evidence less favourable is reluctantly admitted, or even suppressed.

¹ *Concerning Evolution*, 182.

² *Creation by Evolution*, p. x.

As an instance of this take the case of Dr. Dubois, the famous discoverer of the Java man. In 1894 he brought home part of an ape-like skull, a left thigh bone, and three teeth of human type, which he had found near each other in a geological deposit of late pliocene origin. 'Many competent anatomists,' as Sir Arthur Keith says, 'are of opinion that the thigh and teeth are human, the fragment of skull an ape's.' But, aside from that, Dr. Dubois gave to this composite creature the name of *Pithecanthropus erectus* (the erect ape-man), and for a quarter of a century the scientific world discussed him as a missing link, and for the most part accepted him as just the sort of being—half-man, half-ape—we should expect to find at that geological period. In 1920, however, a genuine human skull of pleistocene date was unearthed in Australia, and then, for the first time, Dr. Dubois informed the world that he had found a similar skull in Java before he found *Pithecanthropus*! In plain words, a scientist of international reputation published that part of the evidence which confirmed the dominant theory, while for twenty-six years, during which time the scientific world battled over the question, he kept silence about an important bit of evidence which conflicted with the theory. Sir Arthur Keith's comment on this is, 'We may doubt if Dr. Dubois' reticence was politic, but we cannot question his honesty.' ³ Sir Arthur's conception of honesty would seem to be somewhat primitive.

Again, there was a marked difference between the ready acceptance of the ape-like remains of the Piltdown man and the reluctance to admit the antiquity of the Galley Hill man, a genuine human type, found in an equally ancient deposit. Speaking at a meeting of the Geological Society of London, Sir Arthur Keith says: 'Mr. E. T. Newton who, in 1896, brought the Galley Hill discovery before the same Society as now discussed the Piltdown find, was also present. It must have puzzled him to explain why the audience, which in 1896 refused to accept the Galley Hill discovery, because the remains were those of a being much as we moderns are, should extend so ready an acceptance to the very simian form of man which had been raised from the Piltdown fragments.' ⁴ Elsewhere he deplores this tendency on the part of scientists to let the theory govern the facts. His own estimate is that *homo sapiens* has bred true to type for the last half million years at least, and that the progress of discovery has shown him to have been not the descendant but the contemporary of Neanderthal man and all the rest

³ *The Antiquity of Man*, 440.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 506 f.

of the so-called missing links. This, surely, is an ancestry that might well satisfy the most fastidious.

It is instructive to trace the changes which have gradually taken place in the diagrams which picture the line of man's evolutionary descent. In Haeckel's diagram we find among the direct ancestors of man half-apes, mammals, reptiles, amphibians, and so on. In more recent diagrams question marks begin to take the place of names. One by one the half-apes are moved aside out of the direct line of man's ancestry on to side branches, until in Sir Arthur Keith's diagram the main stem is cleared down to the root. This would seem in a singularly striking way to set man apart, and would of itself justify us in seeing in man, as Sir J. Arthur Thomson sees in him, 'a new synthesis, if ever there was one; no mechanical resultant, but a vital new creation.'¹ Moreover, when we consider how at every stage all along the line of ascent living creatures seem to have missed the upward road and turned aside into blind alleys where they remained fixed or even began to degenerate, does it not suggest that in some mysterious way, deep embedded in Nature, there is a principle inimical to progress, some inscrutable power which continually obstructs and diverts and frustrates? To quote Professor Lloyd Morgan, 'Must we not recognise *fall* to lower levels as well as *rise* to higher levels? The question is one of fact. My belief is that this reversal of order, this downward passage in state or in status is a feature of the world in which we live.'² All this leads us directly to the further question whether man alone of all created beings has completely escaped this influence.

III. THE FALL.

To the rigid evolutionist any such idea as the fall of man is frankly incredible, a rock in the sky, a conception for which no room can be found in his system. And such is the dominance of evolution even in the realm of theological thought that the doctrine of the Fall has in recent times been widely ignored or openly abandoned.

It seems best to approach the matter, not from the side of Scripture, but from a study of the facts as they lie before us. Now the most obvious fact confronting us is the fact of a strange conflict within human nature. Man is at war with himself. By universal consent he is not all that he ought to be. He is conscious himself of having fallen

below his own ideal. He is not true to his own nature as even the lower creatures are. In commenting on this, Chesterton wittily remarks that while we may say to a man, 'Be a man,' there would be no appropriateness in saying to a crocodile, 'Be a crocodile.' The phrase, 'Be a man,' is a confession that man is in some sense not truly himself.

The evolutionary explanation, of course, is that man has not yet been able to rid himself completely of the relics of the brute. It is an explanation flattering, indeed, to the man but less than fair to the brute. It reminds one of the Jewish taunt that the Christians have appropriated all the blessings and left the curses to the Jews. We should think him a mean and foolish fellow who, when overtaken in a fault, should lay the blame on his great-grandfather. Is it any less mean and foolish to lay the blame of man's sin on the ape and tiger? Nothing that the ape and tiger ever did is for a moment comparable to the sum of human wickedness. When we ask where among the lower creatures is there such wanton cruelty, such diabolic infliction of pain as man has been guilty of, we are bidden look at the cat playing with the mouse. *Ridiculus mus*, to set over against the tortures of the Inquisition and the horrors of the world war! If the ape and tiger could retort, they might make some scathing comments on the ways of *homo sapiens*. They might ask whether the present state of the world was to be taken as evidence of his sapience.

But further, there is a qualitative difference more important and significant than the quantitative difference. Sin in man is a thing *sui generis*, with nothing that really corresponds to it in the actions of the lower creatures. It belongs to a world higher than that in which they live and move, the world of moral values. It is distinctive in respect of the fact that it does violence to human nature, which in the voice of conscience protests against it. It creates a sense of shortcoming, a feeling of shame and guilt such as none of the brute creation knows. As Walt Whitman says somewhere, 'Cows don't lie awake at night thinking about their sins.'

The question then is, How has man come to be in this state in which he finds himself? Whence has arisen this conflict within human nature? Why is it that man fails to be what he feels he ought to be, and stands convicted in his own eyes? Manifestly, as this state of things is not only of wide but of universal prevalence, we must seek for some very deep and primeval cause. The stream of human history must have been polluted near

¹ *Concerning Evolution*, 207.

² *Creation by Evolution*, 344.

the fountain-head. We have seen that Professor Lloyd Morgan finds traces throughout the whole course of organic evolution of two opposite tendencies, and recognizes the fact of 'fall to lower levels as well as rise to higher levels.' May it not be that here we have the crowning instance of it? Man has undeniably attained to a higher level of existence than any other living creature, yet somehow he seems not quite to have hit the mark. In the conscience of the race there is irrefragable evidence of this, and our doctrine of man, to be adequate, must take account of the fact. Sir Oliver Lodge maintains the balance when he says, 'The upward step was unmistakable; mankind tripped over it and fell, but not irremediably.'¹

From all this it would appear that the Christian doctrine of the Fall is not necessarily in conflict with the findings of modern science, but on the contrary is capable of being stated in terms of evolution by those who desire so to state it. Somewhere the Rubicon must have been crossed. As there was a point in the creative action which constituted man a 'living soul,' so there must have been a point of moral decision which constituted man a sinner. The root of the matter must have lain from the first in the moral realm. To state it as a mere relic of the beast is to ignore the vital point of guilt. Popular exponents of evolution would claim for man all the credit of the ascent, while they lay on his animal ancestry all the blame of his failure. This has profoundly influenced the modern doctrine of man, presenting him as a heroic being, more to be admired and pitied than blamed, struggling manfully to throw off the burden of heredity, and prove himself the master of his fate and of the world. But does this really accord with the facts as they are before us? Man can claim no credit for his ascent, any more than a Scotsman can claim credit for not being born a Hottentot. The human race, like every other grade of living beings, has been constituted by a mysterious creative act over which man had no control. But, on the other hand, his failure is his very own. On the witness of his own conscience he stands discredited as one who has somehow come short, and is to be blamed for his shortcoming. If we seek to trace this back to its origin, what more likely than that it took its rise in some original act of disobedience wherein man set his will in opposition to the will of God and turned aside after his own way. Speaking of primitive man, Sir Oliver Lodge says, 'He may well have heard a voice whispering to him, as a sort of tempta-

tion, "Ye shall be as gods."'² And in the ambitious pursuit of a false independence man 'tripped on the upward step' and fell.

This doctrine of man as fallen obviously fits into the whole structure of the Christian faith, and gives to the work of Christ a cosmic significance, such as St. Paul assigns to it. We may interpret the evolutionary process as having had for its supreme aim the bringing into being of a family of the sons of God. Why the divine process followed the line it did we cannot tell. 'How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out.' But all along the line and at every stage of the process living creatures appear to have turned aside into blind alleys, where 'progress halts on palsied feet.' For them there is henceforth no salvation; nevermore shall they be upborne on the rising tide of life; their doom is sealed. So there came a point, far higher in the scale of being, when man having been brought thus far on the upward way took the fatal turning and entered on the downward path of sin and death. He thereby cut himself off from the higher reaches of life, and incurred the doom of all the lower creatures, 'Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.' 'Sin entered into the world,' says the Apostle, 'and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.' To reply to this by reminding us that long before man appeared on the scene death was in the world, among the lower creatures, is simply to beg the whole question. The argument has no relevance except on the assumption that man is wholly like the lower creatures and was born to die. It takes no account of the possibility that man, the living soul into whose nostrils had been breathed the breath of life, was not born to die, but that in him at last the rising tide of created life had reached a level where it might have been beyond the reach of death. Only when man fell did he forfeit his destiny and come under the power of death. All this may seem incredible to the modern mind, even as the resurrection of the dead seemed a thing incredible to the first Christian age, but it will be found easier to disbelieve than to disprove. At any rate this assumption lies at the basis of the Christian doctrine of man, and it would seem to be substantiated by that deep instinct in the human race which has led man in every age to cherish the conviction, '*Non omnis moriar.*'

The Christian doctrine of man as fallen, so far from being pessimistic, becomes the starting-point of the highest hopes. It is never preached except

¹ *The Making of Man*, 84.

² *Ibid.*, 84.

188 THE EXPOSITION TIMES

in connexion with the gospel of redemption. It declares sin to be alien from the divine ideal of human nature, a disease that may be cured, a fault that may be forgiven. To fallen man there comes a quickening spirit from above which is able to make him a 'new creature in Christ Jesus.' This is the most glorious of all mutations. Natural science among its most recent findings recognizes the fact that all along the line mysterious influences have caused mutations whereby new species and even new races have suddenly appeared. Following upon this some speculation has been indulged in as to the possible advent of a new and higher race of supermen. The early Christians never spoke of themselves as supermen—that would have been completely alien from their spirit; but

they did recognize themselves as a new race, the *genus* of the sons of God. They believed that in Christ they were following the true line of advance, and had already found in Him Eternal Life. This Christian hope lifts the whole prospect for humanity on to a higher level. It is no longer a dubious upward struggle of the race striving unaided to attain to mastery over Nature, a mastery which in the end is doomed to be overwhelmed in the irresistible downrush of the physical universe. It becomes a divine redemption of the individual as well as of the race, giving the assurance to every man that, though he be fallen indeed below his true nature and destiny, he may yet be redeemed and restored by the grace and power of God.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Pierre Poiret.¹

It is ground for real satisfaction that a serious attempt has at last been made to do justice to the interesting personality and remarkable influence of Pierre Poiret. Dr. Max Wieser, who has already distinguished himself by contributions to the history of mysticism and pietism, has now issued what will be a most useful account, and what is likely to remain a standard source-book in this connexion.

In this volume fully a hundred pages are devoted to a general survey of Poiret's career, his work as a philosopher (especially in relation to Descartes), as an educationist, and finally as a mystic and one of the world's most outstanding propagators of mysticism. Then follow about two hundred pages of well-selected extracts, giving illuminating contemporary descriptions of Poiret and his activities, which bring him before us in the most intimate manner, with characteristic passages from his own writings and from some of the mystical books which his re-issues did so much to preserve and to popularize. His celebrated catalogue of mystical authors is reprinted. A full and careful bibliography is given of Poiret's numerous publications, and a list of available sources of information regarding him. The interest of the book is further

increased by several illustrations, including the Leyden portrait of Poiret.

Pierre Poiret, a French Protestant pastor (1646-1719), after an attack of Cartesianism, became an ardent disciple of Madame Bourignon, the Quietist whose influence so disturbed the Church of Scotland at the close of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth century. Later he took up, with equally exaggerated enthusiasm, the worship of Madame Guyon, and was chiefly responsible for the publication of her works, as he had been of those of Madame Bourignon. He also brought upon the market new editions of numerous mystical works, mediæval and modern, introducing to a wide circle Thomas à Kempis, the *Theologia Germanica*, S. Catherine of Genoa, Angela de Foligni, M. de Renty, Olier, Vincent de Paul, Armelle Nicolas, Malaval, S. Teresa, Brother Laurence, Fénelon, and other mystical influences. He lived for many years in retirement near Leyden, a short-sighted, rather deaf little man in dressing-gown and velvet cap, cheerfully receiving the respectful visitors who came to consult him, and distributing through the press of the Wetsteins at Amsterdam more spiritual nourishment than if he had himself been one of the great mystics. Dislike of sectarian strife, and devotion to a religion of the Love of God were his guiding principles.

One wishes that Dr. Wieser had made some attempt to trace the influence which Poiret exerted

¹ *Peter Poiret, der Vater der romanischen Mystik in Deutschland*, von Dr. Max Wieser (Georg Müller, München; 1932).

in different countries, and especially in our own. Poirer's works are to be found in many libraries in England and Scotland. He was acquainted with such men as the Bourignonist, Dr. George Garden of Aberdeen; Professor James Garden, whose 'Comparative Theology' he twice republished; the Jacobite, Lord Forbes of Pittsligo; the Scottish Episcopalian, Bishop Robert Keith. He corresponded with a Scots medical man in London, and through him distributed mystical books to a considerable circle. He was much discussed by William Law, John Byrom, and others in England interested in the spread of mystical literature. A full inquiry into all this and other similar influences would have deepened the interest of the book for British readers.

There are some small points where defects appear. The list of Poirer's letters omits one in Leyden University Library. To speak of 'the Protestant Archbishop of Salisbury, Dr. Burnetius,' is unfortunate. To suggest Dr. Pordage as the 'celebrated Englishman' in another connexion is scarcely on the mark. M. Guyon's association with the 'Life of Gregory Lopez' is surely not correctly described. The author overlooks the inclusion of Garden's little work in Poirer's 1702 'Theologiæ pacificæ,' etc., as well as in the 1708 volume. Apart, however, from a few such details, the book is of decided value. It will be of great interest to all students of mysticism, and may be the means of bringing readers to a fuller appreciation of mystical literature and to a proper study of it.

G. D. HENDERSON.

Aberdeen.

State and Religion.¹

THESE thirty pages are rather a sad commentary upon the position of modern Germany. The tone of pathos is very marked in Dr. Seeberg's analysis of the age. No doubt, the reaction against religion, especially in its organized forms, is not confined to post-war Germany, but Dr. Seeberg has to face a situation at his own doors which compels him to take stock of the situation, and the result is sobering. In part he traces the trouble to the secularization of life which was started by the French Revolution. Yet the effects of the War have contributed to produce what he thinks is a remarkable paradox, namely, that whilst materialism as a philosophical theory is bankrupt, the spiritual forces of religion do not seem to be even

¹ *Staat und Religion*, by Erich Seeberg (Mohr, Tübingen; M.1.50).

holding their own in the field of actual life, within the social and political order. After sketching the causes of the failure of religion as a practical force, he gives reasons why Protestantism, even in the form of a Church, has a future, by its trenchant witness to God, not by allying itself with any political party. The State must somehow take account of the Church in the order of civilization, and, while maintaining its independence, the Church has to reckon with the State, as it testifies to the true basis of life for citizens. This is hopeful, if somewhat vague—at least, to an outsider. But the essay ends upon a significant note. 'Whatever may happen, we are not afraid of persecution at the hands of a State which has broken away from the civilization of Christian Europe; for we know that martyrs outlive their persecutors. Whatever may happen, we are to try to preserve the sacred island, on which the eternal fire of the Divine Word never goes out; it will be no island of the saints, but it will be the island of the great God, who has many mansions and who supports us all.' To an outsider there is something fine as well as perplexing in this manifesto.

Harnack's 'Dogmengeschichte.'²

ANOTHER volume, the third, of this re-issue of Harnack's masterpiece has come to hand. Again, we note the beauty of the print, and the success of the publishers in presenting so comely and accurate an edition. It is a reprint of the fourth edition, revised by Harnack himself as far back as 1909, so that much work on the subject needs to be estimated as we read the pages of a volume which end with the formulation of doctrine after the Reformation. Practically the sweep of this volume extends from Augustine to the Council of Trent and to Socinus. The strength of it lies in its comprehensive survey, apart from details of interpretation. If the reader will go over the relevant chapters, for example, in the newly published seventh volume of the *Cambridge Medieval History*, where the latest researches are taken into account, and then study Harnack's sections in the present volume, he will realize that, whatever abatements and additions have to be made to the German's estimate of Scholasticism and the Re-

² Adolf Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte; fünfte photomechanisch gedruckte Auflage* (Mohr, Tübingen; pp. xviii, 959). The price for the three volumes is, in paper M.102, bound M.117.

naissance, the line laid down by Harnack remains substantially unaffected.

The admirable index furnishes a clue to the vast stores of information that lie in the undertaking.

Holl's 'Luther.'¹

IT is only ten years since the latest of the nine studies in this volume first appeared, and yet the collected volume is in its sixth edition. This speaks for two things—the wide interest in Luther, and the reputation of Professor Holl as an authority. He is one of the four or five men on the Continent who have now carried the study of Luther along critical lines far beyond anything done by the Roman critics who for a time were first in the field. Not that all Holl's views command assent. Scheel, for example, differs from him more than once. Yet the high quality of these essays is recognized on all hands. 'What did Luther mean by Religion?' 'The Origin of Luther's Idea of the Church,' and 'The Significance of the Reformation for Civilization'—these are some of the topics. I should recommend any one who opens this volume for the first time to begin by reading the short paper upon Luther's ideas about himself (pp. 381-419); it shows Dr. Holl at his best, as an interpreter of character, and at the same time the notes exhibit the scrupulous accuracy which is a merit of his work.

The publishers bring the book within reach of a large public, by making the price so low. Nearly six hundred closely printed pages for fifteen marks (in paper), and, in bound form, for seventeen! There is an adequate index.

Moses.²

THIS is the second edition of an earlier essay, which has been enlarged by the veteran Professor, in the light of twenty-five years spent upon the criticism of the Old Testament. The concentration upon the Prophets, it is held, has tended in some quarters to divert attention from the pre-prophetic religion of Israel, which, in Dr. Volz's view, centres in a worship of Yahweh promulgated by the religious genius of Moses, and promulgated in the Decalogue. Consequently the form and

¹ *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*: Band I. *Luther*, Sechste, neu durchgesehene Auflage, by Karl Holl (Mohr, Tübingen).

² *Mose und sein Werk*, by Paul Volz (Mohr, Tübingen; pp. vii, 143; M.5.40).

meaning of the Decalogue occupy the major portion of the book (pp. 20-71), followed by a general study of the Mosaic institutions (pp. 72-108) and of the influence of Moses during subsequent ages (p. 108 f.). One feature in the Decalogue which impresses Dr. Volz is the absence of ritual provisions; apart from the Sabbath command, there is no stress on any ritual of the cult. And though this does not prove the lack of a cult, it does suggest that for the law-giver the new and essential factors of religion were not ritualistic. He goes the length of arguing that the Mosaic regulations represent the protestantism of antiquity (p. 137). On the Decalogue itself, he is firm: 'So far as I see, there is no reason to doubt the Mosaic origin of any one of the Ten Commandments' (p. 231.); unlike Hans Schmidt, he accepts even the Fourth Commandment as Mosaic (p. 45 f.), and protests against the popular theory that volcanic phenomena at Sinai suggested the idea of a powerful deity (p. 66 f.). The original sense of *bêrith* he maintains (p. 73 f.) was not covenant but constitution, not *Bund* but *Stiftung* or *Fortsetzung*. As for 'Israel,' he agrees with scholars like Sachsse and Caspari (p. 77 f.) that it was a religious name for the new sacred community or folk, which Moses chose and stamped as a term meaning 'God reigns, the reign of God being intimately bound up, as the second table of the Decalogue shows, with moral health. It is in the light of such a vital union between religion and the moral life that Dr. Volz sees the truth of a word like that of Jer 7²²; the indifference of Moses to ritual and sacrifice bears out the verdict of the later prophet (p. 91 f.), as well as that of the earlier Amos (5²⁵). 'Here,' we are told, in this Mosaic programme of essentials, 'there is no mere king who as God's son enjoys special revelation from his God, who, as Amenophis might say, alone knows his God; here is no mystery to which only a consecrated circle has the key; here neither ceremony nor magic rules, in a labyrinth where priests alone can find their way about. From the vital union of religion and morality the free man grows, and this free servant of the supernatural Yahweh knew that he could not approach his sovereign God by means of sorcery and artificial invocations' (p. 95). At bottom it was a layman's religion.

Not that the religion was abstract. Dr. Volz admits that the ark was part and parcel of the Mosaic regulations; it was the sensuous representation of the presence of Yahweh as well as the receptacle for the Decalogue. He allows that the description in Ex 33^{7f.} is a later insertion

p. 104 f.); this is needful, of course, for such a tradition cuts across his own hypothesis. On the other hand he is glad to think, on the basis of Ex 4²⁴⁻²⁸ and Jos 5, that the animistic custom of circumcision was not part of the Mosaic regulations.

Such in bare outline is the argument of this trenchant monograph, which forms a strong statement of its position, and is characterized by a deeply religious interest.

JAMES MOFFATT.

New York.

Contributions and Comments.

Menander and the Epistle to the Hebrews.

IN a recent Essay on *Justin and Menander*,¹ I endeavoured to show that Justin Martyr had quoted a couple of verses from Menander's plays, and that these quotations could readily be restored to metrical form. It was also suggested that the extracted verses had come to Justin through the medium of an Anthology against the Greeks, something like the lost book of Christian *Testimonies against the Jews*, in which Anthology Menander was freely employed. It was further suggested that it was probable that there were traces of Menandrian influence in the New Testament over and above the well-known passage in Mt Co 15 about evil discourse and consequent corrupt morals. It is to this last possibility that I now return; the importance of any such further evidence will be clear. It fills up a blank in the relations between Greek popular ethics and Christian teaching. The two points upon which Justin is laying stress are that 'man should not worship the work of his own hands,' and that 'the artist's greater than his artefact.' We had already suggested that the first of these sentiments was reflected to some degree in the speech of St. Paul before the Areopagus; it will probably be felt, however, that both in Stoic and in Christian circles the sentiment was almost commonplace, if not proverbial. It is, however, far from being trite or commonplace to argue the superiority of the artist to his work, as now expressed in the language of Justin, which we made metrical in the form:

μείζων γὰρ πάντῃ
ὁ δημιουργὸς ἔστι τοῦσκευασμένου.

What shall we say, then, when we find in the third chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews a somewhat intricate argument about the fidelity of Moses in all his house and the superior fidelity of Christ over His own house, in the course of which argument

there is an inset which affirms that 'the builder of a house is more honourable than the house,' which is almost exactly the sentiment of Menander concerning the superiority of the Artist to the Artefact. When we look more closely at the text of the Epistle, we see that the Justin-Menander text has been modified in two ways; the statement 'Greater is the Artist' has become 'More honourable,' and 'more glorious is the builder,' etc., while the somewhat awkward σκευάζω is reflected in the thrice repeated κατασκευάζω. This word is used elsewhere in the Epistle, and so is the peculiar δημιουργός of Menander.

On the whole, there is reason for the suggestion that He 3³ quotes indirectly the very same passage as Justin. The antiquity of the Menandrian quotation is thus made probable, as well as its derivation from an Anthology of excerpts against the Greeks.

It was known already from various points of view that the author (or authors) of the Epistle had drawn largely on the early Christian *Book of Testimonies against the Jews*; it will be interesting, indeed, if we find a similar employment of *Testimonies against the Greeks*.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

Birmingham.

A Note on the Hebrew Root נחם.

THE Arabic root *nahama* means 'to breathe pantingly or hard' (of a horse),² and this primary meaning may be expected to underlie or actually to occur in some of the passages in which the Hebrew root נחם is found.

The connexion between the Arabic and Hebrew roots can be seen in the frequent occurrences in Hebrew of נחם Pi. in the sense of 'to comfort,' the primary meaning being 'to make to breathe.' Dalman is probably right in believing that the Syriac ܢܚܡ meant from the first 'to draw a deep

¹ *Evergreen Essays*, No. 9 (Heffer).

² Lane, *Arab.-Eng. Lex.*, i. viii. p. 3029.

breath (of relief), breathe again,' and that from this primary meaning the further idea of 'to comfort,' *i.e.* 'to make to breathe again' was developed.¹

We may see further the meaning 'breathe pantingly or hard' underlying those occurrences of נחם (Niph. Hithp.) which are translated in the English Versions by 'ease oneself,' 'be comforted,' 'comfort oneself'; see, for example, Is 1²⁴ (Niph.), Ezk 5¹³ (Hithp.), Ps 119⁵² (Hithp.), etc. The underlying idea here will be that of relief gained by taking a deep breath (cp. the phrase 'a sigh of relief').

The primary meaning borne by the Arabic root is shown clearly in Gn 27⁴², where Esau (according to the English Versions) 'doth comfort himself (מתנחם), purposing to kill thee.' The LXX, Vulg., and Pesh. translate נחם here by 'threaten' (ἀπειλεί, minatur, *פחד*). The translation 'is breathing pantingly for (after) thee to kill thee' will express Esau's purposeful eagerness to relieve his feelings by killing Jacob. Such a rendering seems to facilitate the translation of לָךְ, which in the English Versions is represented by the clumsy 'as touching thee.'² In this connexion the use of ἐμβριμάσθαι in Jn 11^{33, 38} is instructive. The Greek word, translated in the English Versions 'groan' (R.V. marg. 'was moved with indignation') is used of horses 'to snort in' (harness). Jones and M'Kenzie,³ in giving this meaning, translate the word in the verses in John by 'was deeply moved.' It is the idea of heavy breathing combined with that of deep emotion that underlies מתנחם in the case of Esau.

Next, there are two cases where נחם is followed by הָבֵל as object. First, in Job 21³⁴ הָבֵל תִּנְחַמְנִי הָבֵל means perhaps not 'How then comfort ye me in vain' (so English Versions), but 'How do ye breathe mere breath at me!'⁴ *i.e.* what nonsense you are talking (see the second half of the verse). Job's friends, therefore, are designated by him not vain comforters but 'windbags.' Secondly, in Zec 10² הָבֵל יִנְחַמֶּנּוּ may mean, not as in the English Versions, 'they comfort in vain,' but 'they breathe mere breath,' *i.e.* the diviners talk nonsense.

The root occurs again in Job 16², where מְנַחֵמִי עָמָל

may mean not 'miserable comforters' (as in the English Versions), but 'breathers out of trouble,' *i.e.* mischief-makers.

A further connexion with the Arabic root can be seen in the Syriac נִסְמָ, which means 'spirare fecit, resuscitavit, excitavit mortuos.'⁵ It is clear that the idea underlying נִסְמָ 'resurrectio'⁶ is that of the dead being once more supplied with breath.⁷

It would seem, then, that the primary meaning of all three roots nahama=נחם=נִסְמָ was 'to take a (deep) breath,' and that several instances of this are preserved in the Old Testament.

Mr. G. R. Driver has drawn my attention to the fact that the Hebrew root נָחַם has gone through a similar semantic development. The primary meaning of the root is 'to breathe, blow' (cp. the Syriac *נחם* Pe. 'flavit, afflavit'),⁸ while in the Hiph. the root means 'to snort, puff' against a person.⁹ Further, in several passages in Proverbs (6¹⁹ 14^{6, 25} 19^{5, 9}) נִזְנוּם is found as the object of the Hiph., and the phrase 'breathe out lies' is very similar to the phrases already referred to in Job, where הָבֵל and עָמָל stand as objects of נחם in the sense of 'to breathe out.' It may be added that in Syriac *נחם*, besides bearing the meaning 'flavit, afflavit,' also means 'respiravit, quievit,'¹⁰ and in this sense is comparable with התנחם 'be comforted' (see exx. of the Hithp. of נחם above).

D. WINTON THOMAS.

Durham.

⁵ Payne-Smith, *Thes. Syr.*, ii. 2337.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 2337-8.

⁷ That Schwally (*Idioticon des christl. pal. Aram.*, p. 54 f.) is wrong in deriving נִסְמָ = ἀνιστάσθαι from the Jewish נחמתא (which he erroneously states is a name for the future world in the Jerus. Targs.) has been shown by Dalman (*op. cit.*, loc. cit.). This same error is found also in Levy, *Chald. Wörterb. über die Targ.* ii. 101 b. As Dalman says, נחמתא is not the resurrection, but redemption in its full extent' (*Words of Jesus*, p. 110).

⁸ Payne-Smith, *op. cit.*, ii. 3053.

⁹ Brown-Driver-Briggs, *op. cit.*, p. 806. In Ps 12⁹ לֹא יִנְחַמֶּנּוּ may be translated 'against whom men puff'; the *lamedh* will then resemble the *lamedh* in Gn 27⁴² (*v. supra*).

¹⁰ Brockelmann, *Lex. Syr.* (2nd ed.), p. 559 (where cp. Ethpa. *נחם* = lenitus est (dolor)).

¹ *Die Worte Jesu*, pp. 71-72.

² For the use of *lamedh* with verbs of dealing or acting towards (whether with friendly or hostile intent), *v. Heb.-Eng. Lex.* (Brown-Driver-Briggs), sub ל, 1 d (p. 510).

³ *Greek-Eng. Lex.*, p. 540.

⁴ For the suffix denoting the remoter object, *v. Gesenius Heb.-Gr.* (Kautzsch-Cowley), 2nd ed., 117 x.